The Origin of Nations

G. Rawlinson M. A.

1.22.12.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Prof. John DeWitt, D.D.

Division D65

Section .R26

ORBIS VETERIBUS BENE COGNITUS,
CUM LIMITIBUS PROVINCIARUM.
TUM ROMANI, TUM PERSICI
IMPERII.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 22 1912
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE

ORIGIN OF NATIONS

In Two Parts

ON EARLY CIVILIZATIONS

ON ETHNIC AFFINITIES, Etc.

By GEORGE RAWLINSON M.A.

CAMDEN PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT HISTORY, OXFORD, AND CANON OF CANTERBURY

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNERS' SONS,
743 and 745 Broadway,
1881.

GRANT, FAIRES & RODGERS,
Electrotypers & Printers,
52 & 54 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia.

PREFACE.

THE following Essays were contributed, as occasional papers, to *The Leisure Hour*, in the course of the years 1875 and 1876. They have now been collected and recast, at the instance of the Committee of the Religious Tract Society, in the hope that they may thereby obtain a permanency which the circumstances of the case do not permit to our periodical literature.

As attacks on the credibility of the Bible—more especially of the earlier books—are now frequently made, not merely upon scientific, but also upon historical grounds, it seemed desirable that one whose business it is to make himself acquainted with all the ascertained facts of Ancient History, should state his impressions with regard to the bearing of modern discoveries in the historical field upon the authenticity of the Scripture narrative. Such a statement the present writer made sixteen

years ago in his contribution to the volume entitled "Aids to Faith," where he summed up his views in the words:—

> "There is really not a pretence for saying that recent discoveries in the field of history, monumental or other, have made the acceptance of the Mosaic narrative in its plain and literal sense any more difficult now than in the days of Bossuet or Stillingfleet."

In the interval between 1861 and 1877, much has been written in disproof of the above conclusion; and it has been the present writer's unpleasant duty to peruse the works as they appeared, and to weigh the arguments employed in them. Of these arguments two only seemed to him to require an answer. One based itself on the supposed historical certainty of a settled monarchy having existed in Egypt from at least B.C. 5000—a fact, if it were a fact, incompatible with the truth of the chronological notices of the Pentateuch. The other was more general. It asserted the very early existence of civilization in various parts of the world; and assuming the unproved hypothesis that man was originally an absolute savage, it required our acceptance of the belief that some such space as a hundred thousand years must have elapsed from the first beginnings of man to his development into his present civilized condition. The Essays on Civilization are directed against these two lines of reasoning. The author is

of opinion that there is no sufficient evidence of a settled monarchy in Egypt prior to about B.C. 2500; and he has endeavoured to set before the public the grounds of his belief on this point. He is further of opinion that civilization can nowhere be traced back to a date anterior to this, and has sought to prove his point by a general survey of the ancient civilizations. Finally, regarding it as a pure assumption that the primitive condition of mankind was one of savagery, he has endeavoured to show cause in favour of the opposite hypothesis, that man's primitive condition was one very remote indeed from savagery, and containing many of the elements of what is now termed civilization.

The Essays on the Ethnology of Genesis are directed to a different point. One modern view of Biblical Inspiration is to the effect, that while the writers of Scripture are to be held as infallible guides in whatever relates to religion and morality, in all other matters they are to be considered as simply on a par with other men, equally limited in their knowledge, equally liable to error, not a whit superior to their contemporaries, or in advance of their age. The accordance of the ethnology of Genesis with the latest results of modern ethnographical science, seems to the present author to deal a rude blow to such a theory; and he has

therefore thought it worth while to exhibit this accordance at some length, in the hope of checking a view which he thinks disparaging to the Divine Word, and of leading those who hold it—often devoutly religious men—to a higher, and (as he believes) a truer theory of Inspiration—the theory most in accordance with the apostle's words—"ALL SCRIPTURE is given by inspiration of God." Origen's argument has always seemed to him sound—that, if in the material world God has wrought every minutest part to a finish and a perfection the highest that it is possible to conceive, *much more* is it to be believed that, in the far more important treasure of His Word, He has left nothing incomplete, but has given to every jot and tittle His full care, the utmost perfection of which it was capable, so that the whole is designed, and is the utterance to man of Absolute Wisdom.

CANTERBURY:
October, 1877.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

EARLY CIVILIZATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE.

Theory of man's original savagery unproved—Connection of the theory with unproved hypothesis of evolution—Appeal to history—Two movements possible, progressive and retrograde—Examples of each—Possible decline from high civilization to extreme savagery proved by the case of the Weddas—The Hebrew account of primeval man makes him no savage — General tradition of a "golden age" in the remotest times—"Golden age" of the Zendavesta, of the Chinese, the Mexicans and Peruvians, the Greeks—No trace of savagery as preceding civilization in Egypt—Early but incomplete civilization of Babylon—Question raised as to the probable date of the earliest civilization in these countries. 1

CHAPTER II.

ON THE ANTIQUITY OF CIVILIZATION IN EGYPT.

Recent assertions with respect to the extreme antiquity of civilization in Egypt—Assertions conflicting—Great diversity of views upon the subject among historians and

PAGE.

Egyptologists—Three points proposed for consideration: I. Extent of the diversity; Views of Mariette, Brugsch, Lepsius, Bunsen, Stuart Poole, and Wilkinson: Tabular exposition of the amount of difference. II. Causes of the diversity: (1) No monumental chronology; (2) Chronology of Manetho uncertain, as containing (*a*) contemporary dynasties, (*b*) differently reported numbers. III. Reasons for preferring the shorter chronology of Stuart Poole and Wilkinson—Possible further reduction. 17

CHAPTER III.

On the Antiquity of Civilization at Babylon.

High antiquity claimed for Babylonian civilization by some writers—View of Bunsen—Want of foundation for this view—Classical date for the foundation of Babylon, B.C. 2230—Views of Berosus agree nearly—Septuagint date for the kingdom of Nimrod, B.C. 2567—Assyrian date of B.C. 2286—General conclusion from the cuneiform inscriptions and Berosus combined—From the inscriptions only—Character of the civilization—Architecture—Implements—Pottery—Writing—Engraving of hard stones —Dresses—Progress made in the different arts unequal. 33

CHAPTER IV.

On the Date and Character of Phœnician Civilization.

Phœnician claim to have originated civilization—Claim disallowed—Yet the civilization was among the earliest—Indications of it in Homer—In Herodotus—In Scripture —Existing Phœnician remains—Phœnician glass—Phœnician dyes—Phœnician music—Chief glory of the Phœnicians, their invention of (exclusively) alphabetic writing —Spread of the writing—Date of Phœnician civilization —Of the founding of Tyre—of Sidon—All requirements satisfied by such a date as B.C. 1600—1500 48

CHAPTER V.

On the Civilizations of Asia Minor—Phrygia, Lydia, Lycia, the Troas.

PAGE.

Claim made by the Phrygians to an extreme antiquity—Their military power about B.C. 1300—Character of their civilization—Period which it covers, from about B.C. 900 to B.C. 565—Antiquity of the Lydian monarchy—Account of Herodotus—His third, or Mermnad dynasty—His second, or Heracleid dynasty—His first dynasty mythic—Lydian civilization not traceable further back than about B.C. 900–850—Chief features of the civilization—Coinage—Trade—Glyptic Art—Tombs of the kings—Flourishing period of Lydia, from B.C. 850 to B.C. 550—Civilization of Lydia remarkable—Beauty of the sculptures—Indications of refinement—High position of women—Early civilization of the Troas—Character of the civilization as shown by recent excavations—Leading features of Aryan civilization 60

CHAPTER VI.

On the Civilizations of Central Asia—Assyria, Media and Persia, India.

Civilization in Central Asia—Supposed antiquity of the Assyrian Empire—View of Ctesias—More moderate chronology of Berosus and Herodotus—Cuneiform monuments fix about B.C. 1500 for commencement of Assyrian independence—Flourishing period begins B.C. 1300—General character of Assyrian civilization—Architecture—Sculpture—Minor Ornamental arts—First beginnings of Iranian civilization—Supposed date of Zoroaster—Earliest portions of Zendavesta not before B.C. 1500—Character of the early civilization—Fresh impulse received about B.C. 850—Greatest development between B.C. 630 and B.C. 450—Leading features of the architecture and sculpture—Decoration of palaces—Literary cultivation—Habits of life—Indic civilization nearly coeval with

PAGE.

Iranic—Four periods of Sanskrit literature—Chronology of the periods—Civilization begins about B.C. 1200—Character of the civilization as indicated by the Vedic writings 86

CHAPTER VII.

Of the Civilization of the Etruscans.

Etruria the source of early Roman civilization—Supposed date of the commencement of Etruscan power, B.C. 1000 or even B.C. 1400—Real date probably not before B.C. 650—Most flourishing period from B.C. 620 to B.C. 500—Character of Etruscan civilization—Architecture—Its massiveness—Walls—Towers—Gateways—Sewers—Vaults—Tombs—Æsthetic art—Statues—Bas-reliefs—Paintings—Bronzes generally—Candelabra—Engraved mirrors—Vases—Figures in clay—Etruscan music—General mode of life—Higher elements of civilization wanting—Characteristics of the government—Low morality—Small progress in science and literature . . . 110

CHAPTER VIII.

On the Civilization of the British Celts.

Supposed high antiquity of Celtic civilization in Britain—Contradicted by Cæsar, Strabo, Diodorus, and others—Account given by Cæsar—Accounts of Diodorus and Strabo—Accounts of Tacitus—Theory that the civilized Celts were those of the interior contradicted by Cæsar—Conclusions of archæologists on the subject—Monuments of the Celtic period—Cromlechs—Pottery—Tools and implements—Druids' circles—Stonehenge and Avebury—Amount of mechanical skill implied in these works not great—No astronomical knowledge implied in them—Low character of the Celtic civilizatiou before the Roman invasion 132

CHAPTER IX.

Results of the Inquiry.

PAGE

General agreement in a modern chronology, except in the single case of Egypt—Extraordinary contrast—Question one to be decided by evidence—Overwhelming evidence needed to establish *very* improbable conclusions—Extreme improbability of Egypt having been the only civilized country for two thousand years—Consideration of the evidence—Defects of the monumental evidence—Contradictions—Incompleteness—Admissions made by Brugsch—Evidence of Manetho—Doubt whether he is correctly reported—Reasons why little reliance is to be placed on his numbers (*a*) as reported; (*b*) as originally set forth Mistakes of Manetho—Absurdity of his general scheme—Recapitulation of conclusions—Their harmony with the chronology of the Septuagint—Tabular view of the chief conclusions arrived at 147

PART II.

ETHNIC AFFINITIES IN THE ANCIENT WORLD.

CHAPTER I.

The Chief Japhetic Races.

The genealogies of Scripture generally regarded as uninteresting—Their real importance—Special interest of those in the 10th chapter of Genesis—The names in the lists ethnic rather than personal—The chapter an "ethnographical essay"—Descendants of Japheth: Gomer, or the Cimmerians (Cymry); Magog, or the Scythians; Madai, or the Medes; Javan, or the Greeks (Ionians); Meshech

PAGE

and TUBAL, or the Moschi and Tibareni; TIRAS, or the Thracians—Summary—Comparison of these statements with the views of modern ethnologists—Identity of the Mosaic names with the chief divisions of the Indo-European race 165

CHAPTER II.

SUBDIVISIONS OF THE JAPHETIC RACES, GOMER AND JAVAN.

Comparative obscurity of the minor details in the Mosaic genealogies—Subdivisions of Gomer and Javan—1. Of Gomer, three: ASHKENAZ, an unknown race; RIPHATH, also unknown; TOGARMAH, or "people of Armenia"—2. Of Javan, four: ELISHAH, or Æolian Greeks; TARSHISH, or people of Tarsus in Cilicia; KITTIM, or Greeks of Cyprus; RODANIM, or Rhodians—Impossibility of determining why two only of the Japhetic races are subdivided—Importance of the principle of subdivision—Geographic position of the Japhetic races 180

CHAPTER III.

THE CHIEF HAMITIC RACES.

Races descended from Ham: Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan—CUSH represents the Ethiopians—MIZRAIM, the people of Egypt—PHUT, probably the "Pet" of the hieroglyphical inscriptions, a people of Nubia—CANAAN, the ancient people of Syria and Palestine—Geographical proximity of these races—Modern ethnology undecided in its view of them—Mixed character of the Egyptian language—Language of the Ethiopians only to be guessed from that of the purer tribes of Abyssinians—The Canaanites generally regarded as Semitic—Grounds of this belief examined—Nothing really known of the Canaanite language — General conclusions negative rather than positive 192

CHAPTER IV.

Subdivision of Cush.

PAGE.

Principal Cushite races, according to Genesis—Sheba, or the people of Meroë—Havilah, or the people of Khawlán, in Arabia—Sabtah, or the people of Sabota, the capital of Hadramaut—Raama, Sheba, and Dedan, or the Arab tribes of the south-east—Sabtechah, a race not identified—Geographic position of these tribes and races—Ethnological inquiry shows two races in Arabia, a northern and a southern—The southern race Cushite—Meaning of the phrase "Cush begat Nimrod"—Geographical position of Nimrod's kingdom—View of the late Baron Bunsen—Cushite character of the early Babylonians proved by Sir H. Rawlinson—General result 204

CHAPTER V.

Subdivisions of Mizraim and Canaan.

Races of Egyptian descent—Ludim, an unknown people—Anamim, also unknown—Lehabim, or Libyans—Naphtuhim, or Na-Petu—Pathrusim, or people of Phaturite nome—Casluhim, an unknown people—Philistim, the Philistines—Caphtorim, the people of Coptos—Nothing known ethnologically of the Na-Petu—Probable resemblance of the Philistines to the Egyptians—Grounds for regarding the Libyans as "cognate" to the Egyptians—Descendants of Canaan—Supposed Semitic character of some disproved 215

CHAPTER VI.

The Semitic Races.

Races descended from Shem—Why placed last—Eber, or the Hebrews—Elam, the people of Elymaïs—Asshur, or the Assyrians—Arphaxad, supposed to be people of Arrapachitis—Lud, the Luden or Ruten of the hieroglyphics

PAGE.

—Aram, or the Syrians—Ethnic character of the Luden and of Elamites uncertain — Semitic character of Aramaic and Hebrew — The Assyrian language and physiognomy Semitic—Summary 228

CHAPTER VII.

On the Subdivisions of the Semitic Races.

Subdivisions of Aram—Uz or Huz, a race of Central Arabia—Hul and Gether, unknown—Mash, a wrong reading for Meshech—may designate the Syrian element in Cappadocia—Descendants of Arphaxad—Races descended from Joktan—Almodad, the Jurhum or Beni Mudad—Sheleph, the Salapeni or Salaf—Hazarmaveth, the people of Hadramaut—Jerah, the people of Yerákh—Hadoram, uncertain—Uzal, the people of Sana in the Yemen—Diklah, the people of Dakalah in the Yemen—Obal and Abimael, uncertain—Sheba, the Sabæans—Ophir, the people of Aphar or Saphar—Havilah, the people of Khawlán—Jobab, perhaps the Jobarites of Ptolemy—All these races Arabian—Arabs predominantly Semitic—Geographical position of the Semites intermediate—Summary of the whole argument 240

APPENDICES.

I. Antiquity of Egyptian Civilization, by Professor Owen, F.R.S. 255

II. The Antiquity of the Chinese, by the Rev. Dr. Edkins, Pekin 262

Index. 273

PART I.

EARLY CIVILIZATIONS.

THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS.

PART I.—ON EARLY CIVILIZATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Theory of man's original savagery unproved—Connection of the theory with unproved hypothesis of evolution—Appeal to history—Two movements possible, progressive and retrograde—Examples of each—Possible decline from high civilization to extreme savagery proved by the case of the Weddas—The Hebrew account of primeval man makes him no savage—General tradition of a "golden age" in the remotest times—"Golden age" of the Zendavesta, of the Chinese, the Mexicans and Peruvians, the Greeks—No trace of savagery as preceding civilization in Egypt—Early but incomplete civilization of Babylon—Questions raised as to the probable date of the earliest civilization in these countries.

IT is commonly assumed at the present day that civilization is a plant of slow and gradual growth, which developed itself by degrees in the course of ages, and which belongs consequently to a comparatively late period of the world's history. The "primeval savage" is a familiar idea; and the so-called "science" of the day is never tired of

presenting before us the primitive race of man as only a little removed from the brutes, devoid of knowledge, devoid of art, devoid of language, a creature in few respects elevated above, and in many sunk below, the anthropoid apes, from whom it is held that he derived his descent by way of evolution. Occasionally, indeed, a confession is made—parenthetically and by the way—that there is no proof of this supposed priority of savagery to any form of civilization ;* and it is admitted to be questionable which of the two preceded the other. But this confession, hurriedly uttered and hastily slurred over in most cases, makes little impression on the public mind, and the belief is general that in some way or other science has proved that the first men who inhabited the earth were savages, and that there was no civilization till a comparatively recent period.

But the question is one which is really quite an open one; it is one on which natural science is quite incompetent to pronounce a judgment, and on which historical research has not hitherto decided in either way. Natural science, of course, if it assumes the doctrine of evolution and applies that doctrine to man, must give the precedence to savagery, which is

* Such a confession was made by Mr. Pengelly at the meeting of the British Association (Bristol, Aug. 1875), but I saw no notice taken of it in the newspapers. Sir Charles Lyell admitted in, I think, his latest work, that "we have no distinct geological evidence that the appearance of what are called the inferior races of mankind has always preceded in chronological order that of the higher races."—"Antiquity of Man," p. 90.

manifestly more congenial than civilization to the anthropoid ape. But if the doctrine of evolution is recognized as a mere hypothesis, one out of many theories as to the mode in which things that are have been brought into the state in which they are, and a theory which lacks altogether any confirmation from fact, then science has to confess that she can give no decision on the point in question, but must leave it to the judgment of those who are familiar with historic facts.

Now, historic facts show that either of two movements is possible. Man can and does often, perhaps most usually, pass from the savage into the civilized condition. We have numerous instances of this transition, which we can follow step by step, and put (as it were) under a metaphysical microscope. We see the Greek pass from the simple, semi-savage state described by Homer to the condition of high civilization placed before us by Thucydides and Xenophon. We see the Romans gradually exchange the robber life of the eighth century B.C. for the splendour of the Augustan age, or the paler but purer radiance of the court of the Antonines. In later times, we observe the Arab hordes, issuing from the desert unkempt and almost naked, with no literature but the confused jumble known as the Koran, no arts but those of forging iron and weaving a coarse cloth; and we trace their progress from this rude condition to the glories of the Baghdad caliphate and the magnificence of Granada. All over Western Europe we see the barbarous races which overran and crushed

the Roman empire settling down into a less wild and savage life, adopting the arts as well as the religion of the conquered, and gradually emulating or surpassing the civilization which at their first coming they destroyed. In our own time, and before our eyes, a civilizing process is going on in Russia and in Turkey; serfdom disappears; nomadic tribes become settled; the arts, the habits, even the dress, of neighbouring nations, are in course of adoption; and the Muscovite and Turkic hordes are becoming scarce distinguishable from other Europeans.

But, while this is the more ordinary process, or at any rate the one which most catches the eye when it roves at large over the historic field, there are not wanting indications that the process is occasionally reversed. Herodotus tells us of the Geloni,* a Greek people, who, having been expelled from the cities on the northern coast of the Euxine, had retired into the interior, and there lived in wooden huts, and spoke a language "half Greek, half Scythian." By the time of Mela this people had become completely barbarous, and used the skins of those slain by them in battle as coverings for themselves and their horses.† A gradual degradation of the Greco-Bactrian people is apparent in the series of their coins, which is extant, and which has been carefully edited by the late Professor H. H. Wilson‡ and by Major

* Herod. iv. 108.

† Pomp. Mel. ii. 1. "Geloni hostium cutibus, equos seque velant, illos reliqui corporis, se capitum." Compare Solinus, "Polyhist." § 20, and Amm. Marc. xxxi. 2.

‡ See his "Ariana Antiqua. Plates.

Cunningham.* We trace a certain degeneration in the Jews of the post-Babylonian period, if we compare them with their compatriots from the accession of David to the captivity of Zedekiah. The modern Copts are very degraded descendants of the ancient Egyptians, and the Roumans of Wallachia have fallen away very considerably from the level of the Dacian colonists of Trajan. In America, both North and South, the modern descendants of the Spanish conquerors are poor representatives of the Castilian gentlemen who, under Cortez and Pizarro, made themselves masters of the Mexican and Peruvian kingdoms, and introduced into the new world the time-honoured civilization of the old.

Civilization, as is evident from these and various other instances, is liable to decay, to wane, to deteriorate, to proceed from bad to worse, and in course of time to sink to so low a level that the question occurs, Is it civilization any longer? But still, perhaps, a doubt may be entertained whether the relapse can be complete—whether, that is to say, any people which has once participated in a high civilization can ever under any circumstances be reduced to absolute savagery. In most of the cases that have been quoted, while a certain deterioration has taken place, the end has not been actual savagery or barbarism, but rather a low and degraded form of civilization, retaining traces of something higher, and considerably raised above the condition of the

* "Numism. Chron." New Series, vols. viii. and ix.

absolute savage. Are there any cases, it may be asked, where the degradation has proceeded beyond this, where a civilized race has lapsed into complete and absolute barbarism?

Now, it is exceedingly difficult—it is almost, if not quite, impossible—to *trace* such cases. So long as contact with civilization remains, the degeneration will not be extreme. Savagery can only be reached where there is a complete separation from civilized mankind, and at the same time such a condition of the physical circumstances as demands the concentration of all mental power on efforts to support life. But in such cases there is, of course, no record. The race, tribe, nation has passed beyond the ken of its civilized neighbors, and has no time to spare for recording its own history. It loses all knowledge of the past, all power of noting events; and if, in after time, it is so bold as to venture an account of its "Origines," the narrative is evolved from the inner consciousness—is pure fancy, and has no claim to be regarded as even built on any historical foundation. Complete and continuous historical evidence, therefore, of such a degeneration as we are now speaking of is not to be looked for; and we must be content to accept as sufficient proof of what is so difficult to be proved evidence of a lower kind. Now, Comparative Philology does present to us cases where there is reason to presume an original participation in a high civilization, though the present condition of the race is almost the lowest conceivable.

An instance of this kind is furnished by the very

curious race still existing in Ceylon, and known as the "Weddas." The best comparative philologists pronounce the language of the Weddas to be a debased descendant of the most elaborate and earliest known form of Aryan speech—the Sanskrit; and the Weddas are on this ground believed to be degenerate descendants of the Sanskritic Aryans who conquered India. If this be indeed so, it is difficult to conceive of a degeneration which could be more complete. The Sanskritic Aryans must, by their language and literature, have been, at the time of their conquest, in a fairly advanced stage of civilization. The Weddas are savages of a type than which it is scarcely possible to conceive anything more debased. Their language is limited to some few hundred vocables; they cannot count beyond two or three; they have, of course, no idea of letters; they have domesticated no animal but the dog; they have no arts beyond the power of making bows and arrows, and constructing huts of a very rude kind; they are said to have no idea of God, and scarcely any memory. They with difficulty obtain a subsistence by means of the bow, and are continually dwindling, and threaten to become extinct. In height they rarely exceed five feet, and are thus degenerate both physically and intellectually.*

Thus, on the whole, there would seem to be

* See "Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science for the year 1875," part iii. p. 175, where an abstract is given of a paper on the Weddas, by Mr. B. F. Hartshorne, which I had the pleasure of hearing read.

grounds for believing, broadly, that savagery and civilization, the two opposite poles of our social condition, are states between which men oscillate freely, passing from either to the other with almost equal ease, according to the external circumstances wherewith they are surrounded. If the circumstances become ameliorated, if life becomes less of a struggle, if leisure be obtained, civilization (as a general rule) grows up; if these conditions are reversed, if the struggle for existence tends to occupy the whole attention of each man, civilization disappears, the community becomes barbarized, and the savage condition is reached.

What, then, does history say as to the priority of the one state or the other? History, no doubt shows abundant instances of improvement, of an advance from a comparatively low condition to a higher one, of civilization developing itself out of a savage or a semi-savage state, and gradually progressing until it arrives at a sort of *quasi*-perfection. But what does the earliest history say as to the earliest condition of mankind? Does it accord with the bulk of those who write the accounts, now so common, of "prehistoric man?" Does it make the "primeval man" a savage, or something very remote from a savage? To us it seems that, so far as the voice of history speaks at all, it is in favour of a primitive race of men, not indeed equipped with all the arts and appliances of our modern civilization, but substantially civilized, possessing language, thought, intelligence, conscious of a Divine Being,

quick to form the conception of tools, and to frame them as it needed them, early developing many of the useful and elegant arts, and only sinking by degrees, and under peculiar circumstances, into the savage condition.

In proof of this we shall allege, first and foremost, that sacred record which is, even humanly speaking, one of the most valuable fragments of antiquity that has come down to us—the opening section of Genesis, chapters i. to v. In this we find our first parents represented much as Milton has drawn them:—

> "Two of far nobler shape, erect and tall,
> Godlike erect, with naked honour clad
> In naked majesty, seemed lords of all;
> And worthy seemed; for in their looks divine
> The image of their glorious Maker shone,
> Truth, wisdom, sanctitude, severe and pure;
> Severe, but in true filial freedom placed;
> Whence true authority in men."

No savages are this simple pair, but clever, intelligent, quick to invent, able to sew themselves coats on the first perception of the need of them (Gen. iii. 7), able during their innocence to enjoy high converse with God and with each other, able to suggest to their children the two chief modes of life by which subsistence is readily procured in simple times, the pastoral and the agricultural. No gradual working onward, with toil and pain, from the life of the hunter to that of the shepherd, and from the life of the shepherd to that of the cultivator, is set before us—the two sons first born to the first man are re-

spectively "a tiller of the ground" and "a keeper of sheep" (Gen. iv. 2). Again, the primeval race does not find a shelter in hollow trees or in caverns, neither does it burrow under ground, like some tribes of Africans. The eldest son of the first man "builded a city" (Gen. iv. 17)—not, of course, a Nineveh or a Babylon, but still (עִיר) a city—a collection of habitations, permanent and fixed, fitted together by human skill, a sufficient protection against extremes of heat and cold, or against storms and rainy weather. Later, not earlier than this, the tent is invented (Gen. iv. 20), and then, while the first man is still alive, instrumental music comes into being; the harp and flute are framed by skilful hands (Gen. iv. 21), and the pastoral life is enlivened by the charms of melody. Copper and iron are smelted at the same period (Gen. iv. 22), and a race of artificers in metal grows up, which produces tools and weapons of war, perhaps also works of artistic beauty.

Such is the account given in one of the earliest historical records that has come down to us—a record whose historical value is not diminished by the fact that, according to the general belief of the Jewish and Christian worlds, it is inspired. We proceed to consider whether this record is in accordance, or not, with such other historical evidence as exists upon the point in question.

Now, it will scarcely be denied that the mythical traditions of almost all nations place at the beginning of human history a time of happiness and per-

fection, a "golden age," which has no features of savagery or barbarism, but many of civilization and refinement. In the Zendavesta, Yima-khshaeta (Jemshid), the first Aryan king, after reigning for a time in the original *Aryanem vaejo*, removes with his subjects to a secluded spot, where both he and they enjoy uninterrupted happiness. In this place "was neither overbearing nor mean-spiritedness, neither stupidity nor violence, neither poverty nor deceit, neither puniness nor deformity, neither huge teeth, nor bodies beyond the usual measure." * The inhabitants suffered no defilement from the evil spirit. They dwelt amid odoriferous trees and golden pillars; their cattle were the largest, best, and most beautiful on the earth; they were themselves a tall and beautiful race; their food was ambrosial, and never failed them.† The Chinese speak ‡ of a "first heaven," an age of innocence, when "the whole creation enjoyed a state of happiness; when everything was beautiful, everything was good; all beings were perfect in their kind." Mexican tradition tells of the "golden age of Tezeuco;" § and Peruvian history commences with two "Children of the Sun," who establish a civilized community on the borders of Lake Titicaca.‖ The elegant imagination of the Greeks described the first age as follows:—

* Vendidad, Fargard, ii. § 29.

† See the author's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. ii. p. 341, second edition.

‡ Faber, "Horæ Mosaicæ," ch. iv. p. 147.

§ Prescott, "Conquest of Mexico," ch. vi.

‖ Ibid. "Conquest of Peru, ch. i. p. 8.

"The immortal gods, that tread the courts of heaven,
First made a golden race of mortal men.
Like gods they lived, with happy careless souls,
From toil and pain exempt; nor on them crept
Wretched old age, but all their life was passed
In feasting, and their limbs no changes knew.
Nought evil came them nigh; and, when they died,
'Twas but as if they were o'ercome by sleep.
All good things were their portion: the fat soil
Bare them its fruit spontaneous, fruit ungrudged
And plentiful; they at their own sweet will
Pursued in peace the tasks that seemed them good,
Laden with blessings, rich in flocks, and dear
To the great gods."*

Such is the voice which reaches us on all sides from that dim and twilight land, where the mythical and historical seem to meet and blend together inseparably. Can we go at all beyond this? Can we say that history proper tells us anything upon the subject, or leans at all to one side of the question rather than the other?

It is plain that there are very few nations which even profess to have a history that goes back to the beginning of all things. Of the few which make such a profession, some, like the Chinese and the Hindoos, appear upon inquiry to do so without any valid ground, their real histories commencing not very long before the Christian era. Others may perhaps have more reason for the claims which they urge. Egypt and Babylonia have monuments to show which antedate probably all others upon the earth's surface. If real history is to have anything

* Hesiod, "Op. et Dies." ll. 109—120.

to say with regard to the problem before us, it is to Egypt and Babylonia that we must look for light upon this vexed question.*

Now, in Egypt, it is notorious that there is no indication of any early period of savagery or barbarism. All the authorities agree that, however far we go back, we find in Egypt no rude or uncivilized time out of which civilization is developed. Menes, the first king, changes the course of the Nile, makes a great reservoir, and builds the temple of Phthah at Memphis.† Athothis, or Tosorthmus, his son and successor, is the builder of the Memphite palace, and a physician, who wrote books on anatomy.‡ The Pyramid period falls very early in Egyptian history, but "the scenes depicted in the tombs of this epoch show that the Egyptians had already the same habits

* The finding, by Dr. Schliemann and others, of traces of an earlier platform of life below the first civilization of Greece or Asia Minor, so far from proving the occurrence of a very long lapse of years, during which the same people slowly progressed from savagery into civilization, proves exactly the contrary. There was occupation by barbarians, the nomads or offshoots of population elsewhere, there may have been occupation by them for some considerable time, there was some improvement in the apparatus of life, but all this was superseded suddenly by the advent of more civilized conquerors, who in their turn occupied and flourished, and were again displaced, in one case by a less civilized community, but usually by a people better armed and accoutred. The layers of monumental remains are successive, but not in the succession of a single series but of successive displacements. There is no single case, in east or west, of a steady uninterrupted *progress* from barbarism to civilization, and therefore the theory of time proposed to be based on this has literally no foundation.

† Herod. ii. 99.

‡ Manetho ap. Euseb. "Chron. Can." i. 20, § 4.

and arts as in after-times; and the hieroglyphics in the Great Pyramid prove that writing had been long in use. We see no primitive mode of life in Egypt; no barbarous customs; not even the habit, so slowly abandoned by all people, of wearing arms when not on military service, nor any archaic art. . . In the tombs of the Pyramid period are represented the same fowling and fishing scenes as occur later; the rearing of cattle, and wild animals of the desert; the scribes using the same kind of reed for writing on the papyrus an inventory of the estate, which was to be presented to the owner; the same boats, though rigged with a double mast instead of the single one of later times; the same mode of preparing for the entertainment of guests; the same introduction of music and dancing; the same trades, as glass-blowers, cabinet-makers, and others; as well as similar agricultural scenes, implements and granaries."*

In Babylonia there is more indication of early rudeness. The bricks of the most ancient buildings are coarsely made; the vases found in them are clumsy and irregular in shape; and implements in flint and stone are not uncommon. But on the other hand there are not wanting signs of an advanced state of certain arts, even in the very earliest times, which denote a high degree of civilization, and contrast most curiously with the indications of rudeness here spoken of. Among the objects recovered are the cylinder-seals of two monarchs who are among

* Sir G. Wilkinson in the author's "Herodotus," vol. ii. p. 291 second edition.

the most ancient of the series; and on these seals, which are of hard stone, very difficult to engrave, we have, in the first place, a primitive form of cuneiform writing; and secondly, elaborate representations of men wearing elegant flounced or fringed robes, and with crowns on their heads; and in one case we have a representation of an elegant chair or throne, the hind legs of which are modelled after the leg of an animal. Mechanical and artistic skill had thus, it is evident, reached a very surprising degree of excellence; the engraving of hard stones, probably with steel and emery, was practised; and writing was in constant and familiar use, at almost the very remotest period to which the Babylonian records carry us back.*

A question of considerable interest presents itself with respect to these earliest forms of civilization—the most remote whereto history carries us back—viz., What is their probable date? Can we fix, definitely, or within certain limits, the chronology of Egypt and Babylon, or must such matters be left in the shadowy vagueness in which writers on "prehistoric man" love to indulge when they deal with the "Origines" of the human race? We propose to examine this question in the next and following chapters; and, if we are not mistaken, we shall be

* See the author's "Ancient Monarchies," pp. 118, 119, first edition. To the cylinder there described—that of Urukh—may be added a more recent discovery, the signet of his son and successor, which has three well-drawn figures on it, together with twelve lines of cuneiform writing.

able, without very much difficulty, to dispel an illusion, fostered by some great names, that the present state of our historical knowledge requires an enormous expansion of the ordinarily accepted chronology—an expansion (as some suppose) of 4,000 into 10,000, 15,000, or even 20,000 years.* *Some* expansion of what has been called "the authorized chronology"—though it is not authorized—may be necessary; but such enlargements as have been proposed are, it is believed, excessive, there being no sufficient evidence to justify them, and the general results of historical inquiry up to the present time being such as to render them highly improbable.

* See Bunsen, "Egypt's Place in Universal History," vol. v. p. 103.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE ANTIQUITY OF CIVILIZATION IN EGYPT.

Recent assertions with respect to the extreme antiquity of civilization in Egypt—Assertions conflicting—Great diversity of views upon the subject among historians and Egyptologists—Three points proposed for consideration: I. Extent of the diversity; Views of Mariette, Brugsch, Lepsius, Bunsen, Stuart Poole, and Wilkinson; Tabular exposition of the amount of difference. II. Causes of the diversity: (1) No monumental chronology; (2) Chronology of Manetho uncertain, as containing (*a*) contemporary dynasties, (*b*) differently reported numbers. III. Reasons for preferring the shorter chronology of Stuart Poole and Wilkinson—Possible further reduction.

IN September, 1874, Professor Owen, speaking at the International Congress of Orientalists in London,* declared that the space of "7,000 years was but a brief period to be allotted to the earliest, the oldest civilized and governed community," that of Egypt. In September, 1875, Sir John Hawkshaw, in his address to the British Association, at Bristol,† spoke, with more moderation, of the art of building in stone, as "having reached the greatest perfection in Egypt" (in the erection of the great pyramid) "5,000 years ago." It is manifest that these statements are conflicting. The one would place the commencement of Egyptian civilization

* See the "Times" of Sept. 21, 1874.

† Ibid. Aug. 26, 1875.

about B.C. 5000; the other 1,500 years later. Even the latter estimate is, according to some writers, extravagant, being (as they think) as much as a thousand years in excess of the true date.

Curious as such contradictions seem, and widely at variance with ordinary chronological notions as is the idea of an Egypt with a continuous history reaching back *at the least* 7,000 years, yet it must be confessed that the scientific men who make such statements upon platforms can quote in support of their views historians of eminence. A great diversity of opinion does in fact exist among those who have devoted their main time and attention to the language and antiquities of Egypt, on the point of the real historical chronology of the country; and there are Egyptologists who maintain views not very different from those of Professor Owen. That there are others who advocate a very moderate Egyptian chronology is no less true; and it would be as well perhaps if scientific men, when they touch the point, would mention the diversity of views existing with respect to it. They may, however, not always be aware of the fact, since their historical reading must be limited, and they may thus unconsciously mislead the public. We hold it very important that the fact should be known; and we propose therefore, in the present chapter, to place before our readers, first of all, a statement of the extent of the variation which exists in the views of first-rate Egyptologists on the subject of the Antiquity of Civilization in Egypt. We shall then

endeavour to explain the grounds upon which the different writers base their views, and so to unfold the causes of the variation. Finally, we shall try to come to some conclusion upon the question, to which of the views probability, upon the whole, most inclines.

I. A general consent on the part of almost all authors attaches the commencement of civilization in Egypt to the name of a certain M'na, Mên, or Menes,* who is believed to have been the first king. The Greek writers and the Egyptian monuments agree in assigning to Menes this position, and consequently we may regard the inquiry upon which we are entering as equivalent to another, viz., "At what time did King Menes ascend the Egyptian throne?" Now the earliest date which we find assigned by modern authors to this event is the year B.C. 5004. This is the date preferred by M. Mariette, "Director of the Service of Conservation of the Antiquities of Egypt," and founder, arranger, curator, and expositor of the Museum of Antiquities at Cairo. It has been adopted † in his "Manual of Ancient Oriental History," by M. Mariette's most distinguished follower, M. François Lenormant, and is now generally taught in the schools of France, where M. Lenormant's work has been accepted as an educational handbook. The "7,000 years" of Professor Owen is, we presume, produced by adding

* M'na is a native form of the word; Mên, that used by Herodotus (ii. 99); Menes is found in Manetho (ap. Euseb. "Chron. Can.," i. 20).

† See the "Manual de l'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol. i. p. 321.

the date A.D. 1875 to B.C. 5004, and expressing the sum total by a round number.

Dr. Brugsch, Director of the Museum of Antiquities at Berlin, and the author of a valuable "History of Egypt," placed in 1859 the accession of Menes in the year B.C. 4455, five centuries and a half later than the time assigned to it by MM. Lenormant and Mariette.* He has since (in 1875) corrected his date to B.C. 4400.†

Dr. Lepsius in his "Chronologie der Egypter," published in 1849, gave the date of Menes as B.C. 3892, while Baron Bunsen originally fixed his accession to the year B.C. 3623. Subsequent researches and calculations induced the latter writer to modify his earlier views, and finally he gave, in the last volume of his "Egypt,"‡ as the first of Menes the year B.C. 3059.

Mr. Reginald Stuart Poole, head of the Numismatic Department in the British Museum, and a good hieroglyphic scholar, in his article on "Chronology," written for the "Dictionary of the Bible" in 1860, gave the date of B.C. 2717 as that to which his calculations led him,§ at the same time admitting

* "Histoire d'Egypte," p. 287.

† See his second edition of the "Histoire d'Egypte" (Leipsic, 1875), premiére livraison, p. 179. This statement depends in the main on the supposition that in Egypt the average length of a king's reign was 33⅓ years, so that three reigns went to a century. But the real average duration of monarchs' reigns in the East does not exceed 20 years, so that Dr. Brugsch's estimate is two-fifths in excess.

‡ "Egypt's Place in Universal History," vol. v. p. 63.

§ "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 508.

the great uncertainty in which the whole subject of early Egyptian chronology was involved, and desiring that his numbers should be considered as merely approximate.

Sir Gardner Wilkinson, who, on the whole, must be regarded as the greatest of English Egyptologers, declared, in the year 1862, that he agreed in the main with Mr. R. Stuart Poole,* but, slightly modifying some of his numbers, produced, as the approximate date of the accession of Menes, the year B. C. 2691.†

These views all claim to be the results of original research, and have been put forward by persons (more or less) acquainted with the Egyptian monuments, and (more or less) competent to translate and expound the hieroglyphical inscriptions. Before proceeding to explain how it comes to be possible that such different views can be taken, it will, perhaps, help the reader to appreciate the diversity if we tabulate the views themselves, and express numerically their differences :—

DATE FOR ACCESSION OF MENES.

	B. C.	Later than Mariette.	Later than Brugsch.	Later than Lepsius.	Later than Bunsen.	Later than Stuart Poole.
Mariette and Lenormant	5004	—	—	—	—	—
Brugsch	4400	604	—	—	—	—
Lepsius	3892	1111	508	—	—	—
Bunsen (early view)	3623	1381	777	260	—	—
Bunsen (later view)	3059	1945	1341	833	—	—
Stuart Poole . . .	2717	2287	1683	1175	342	—
G. Wilkinson . . .	2691	2313	1719	1201	368	26

* Rawlinson's "Herodotus," vol. ii. p. 287, second edition.

† Ibid. pp., 289, 290.

II. We have now to show how it has happened that these various writers, having all of them the same data, have been able to come to such very different conclusions, conclusions which, as will be seen, differ in the extremest case by a period of *above two thousand three hundred years!*

1. Now the first cause of such a great diversity is the fact that the Egyptians themselves were without the chronological idea. Not only had they no era, but it was not their habit to enter into computations of time, or to trouble themselves with anything beyond the consideration of the number of years that the existing "divinity" had sat upon the Egyptian throne. In some few cases, where another divinity, incarnate Apis, was believed to have been present with them, they went so far, in noting his arrival and departure, as to mention in one connection the regnal years of two kings; and from these notices —known as those of the Apis *Stelæ**—we sometimes obtain important results; but otherwise chronology is upon the Egyptian monuments almost non-existent. This is the unanimous confession of the Egyptologers. "The evidence of the monuments" in respect of the chronology, says Mr. R. Stuart Poole,† "is neither full nor explicit. "Chronology," says Baron Bunsen,‡ "cannot be elicited from them." "The greatest obstacle," says M.

* See M. Mariette's work, entitled, "Renseignements sur les soixante-quatre Apis trouvés au Sèrapéum," Paris, 1855.

† "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 506, col. ii.

‡ "Egypt's Place in Universal History," vol. i. p. 32.

Mariette,* "to the establishment of a regular Egyptian chronology is the circumstance that the Egyptians themselves *never had any chronology at all.*"

2. In default of any general monumental scheme of Egyptian chronology, all attempts to construct such a scheme must have been abandoned had not a work been written by an Egyptian priest under the Ptolemies (ab. B.C., 280—250), of which certain abstracts have come down to us. Manetho, a priest of Sebennytus, composed in Greek, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, a history of Egypt which he professed to have taken from the archives preserved in the Egyptian temples. This work is lost, but abstracts of it have reached us in the writings of Eusebius† and Syncellus,‡ and a few quotations in those of Josephus, by means of which a good idea may be formed of its general character. It divided Egyptian history into three periods, which it called respectively the Old Empire, the Middle Empire, and the New Empire. To the first of these it assigned eleven dynasties; to the second, six dynasties; to the third, fourteen dynasties; in all, thirty-one dynasties. It assigned to each dynasty a certain number of years, and (without perhaps distinctly stating that it was so §) pro-

*As quoted by M. Lenormant ("Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol. i. p. 322.—"Le plus grand de tous les obstacles à l'établissement d'une chronologie Egyptienne réguliére, c'est que les Egyptiens eux-mêmes n'ont jamais en de chronologie.")

† See Euseb., "Chron. Can.," i. 20.

‡ Syncell., "Chronograph," pp. 55—78.

§ It is not at all clear that Manetho himself represented all his dynasties as consecutive. Neither Eusebius nor Africanus appears to have been in possession of his work. So far as we can tell, all

duced the impression that the dynasties were consecutive, and formed a single continuous series. Had this been the case, the time which they had occupied would have been, according to Manetho's numbers, from 5,040 to 5,358 years,* and the commencement of the Old Empire would have fallen between B.C. 5372 and B.C. 5678.

Lists of kings, accompanied by regnal years, but unaccompanied by events, or accompanied only by very improbable events, as that one of them was carried off by a hippopotamus, and that under another the Nile flowed with honey for eleven days, † are not generally treated with much tenderness by modern historical critics, who are apt to consign the Assyrian and Median lists of Ctesias,‡ the Sicyonian, Argive, Athenian, and early Macedonian lists of

that they had before them was a *Synopsis*, or abstract. The *opinion* of Eusebius was distinctly that many of the dynasties were contemporary. "If the quantity of time is in excess," he says, "we must remember that there were, perhaps, at one and the same time, several kings in Egypt; for *we are told* that the Thinites and Memphites reigned simultaneously, and likewise the Ethiopians and the Saites, and others also. Moreover, some seemed to have reigned in one place, some in another, each dynasty being confined to its own canton; so that the several kings did not rule successively, but different kings reigned at the same time in different places."—"Chron. Can.," i. 20, sec.3.

*Manetho's dynasty numbers, as given by Syncellus, professedly from Eusebius, produce a minimum of 5,040 years; as reported in the Armenian Version of Eusebius, a minimum of 5,207 years; as reported by Eusebius from Africanus, they give 5,358 years.

† Manetho ap. Eusebium, "Chron. Can.," i. 20, sec. 4.

‡ Ap. Syncell., "Chronograph.," pp. 96—165; and ap. Diod. Sic., ii. 32—34.

Eusebius,* the Corinthian list of Diodorus,† and the Alban list of Livy‡ to the historical waste-paper basket. Manetho has been made an exception to the general rule, on account of the fact that his lists accord to a great extent with those on the Egyptian monuments, and appear beyond any reasonable doubt to have been drawn from them. His kings are thus admitted on all hands to be—for the most part, at any rate—real personages, veritable men who held the royal dignity at some time or other in some part of Egypt. The question which alone divides historical critics, and which produces the existing diversity of opinion with respect to the duration of Egyptian civilization, is simply this—Were the dynasties of Manetho continuous, or were any of them contemporary? If the latter, what deduction are we to make from his numbers on account of contemporaneousness?

One writer—and one only—has denied that any two of Manetho's thirty-one dynasties were contemporary. "There were undoubtedly," says M. Mariette, "dynasties in Egypt which reigned simultaneously; but *Manetho has rejected them*, and has admitted none but those reckoned legitimate; *the secondary dynasties are no longer in his lists.*" And again, "There is superabundant monumental proof collected by Egyptologers to show that *all the royal*

* "Chron. Can.," i., 25, 27, 30, and 37.

† Ap. Euseb., "Chron. Can.," i. 34.

‡ Liv., i. 3. Compare Dionys. Hal. i., pp. 162—179; Ovid, "Met.," xiv. 609—623; Eusebius, "Chron.Can.," ii., pp. 299–320.

races enumerated by the priest of Sebennytus (Manetho) *occupied the throne one after the other.*"*

All other Egyptologers are of a different opinion. All believe that Manetho has not wholly eliminated from his list contemporary dynasties, but has, on the contrary, included them occasionally. The differences between the various chronological schemes which we have already exhibited arise mainly from diversity of view as to the extent to which contemporary dynasties are admitted. M. Lenormant, in most respects the *alter ego* of M. Mariette, here, in this essential matter, deserts his master, and maintains that Manetho's eleventh dynasty was contemporary with his ninth and tenth, and his fourteenth dynasty contemporary with his thirteenth.† Dr. Brugsch makes the ninth and tenth dynasties contemporary with the eighth and eleventh; the fourteenth with the thirteenth; the seventeenth with the fifteenth, sixteenth, and part of the eighteenth; and the twenty-fifth with the end of the twenty-fourth and the beginning of the twenty-sixth.‡ Baron Bunsen advances a step beyond Dr. Brugsch; he places the second, fifth, ninth, tenth, fourteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth in the list of collateral dynasties, regarding them as parallel to the third, the sixth, the eighth, and the fifteenth.§

* Quoted by Lenormant in his "Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol. i. pp. 323, 324.

† "Manuel de l'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol. 1, pp. 348, 358. ‡ "Histoire de l'Egypte," pp. 47, 49, 72, 288.

§ "Egypt's Place in Universal History," vol. ii. pp. 106, 208, 239; and vol. iv. pp. 499, 500, 510—512.

Finally, the English Egyptologers, Sir G. Wilkinson and Mr. R. Stuart Poole, carry out the principle of contemporaneousness still further than Baron Bunsen. With them, the third dynasty is contemporary with the first; the second with the fourth and fifth; the ninth, tenth, and eleventh with the sixth; the twelfth and thirteenth (at Thebes), the fourteenth (at Xoïs); and the three Shepherd dynasties, the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth, with the seventh and eighth (at Memphis).*

Besides this main cause of difference in the chronological schemes, there is a second arising from the uncertainty of Manetho's numbers, which are variously reported by Eusebius and Africanus.† Eusebius gives the ninth dynasty 100 years, Africanus 409 years. Eusebius makes the three Shepherd dynasties reign respectively, 250, 190, and 108 years; Africanus, 284, 518, and 151 years, the sum of the differences in this latter case being 410 years. There is no reconciling these differences, and historians choose, as they please, the longer or the shorter estimates.

III. We come now to the final question, Which view of Egyptian chronology is, on the whole, to be preferred? Are we, with M. Mariette and Professor Owen, to regard civilization as having commenced in

* "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 508; Rawlinson's "Herodotus," vol. ii. Appendix to Book ii. ch. viii. secs. 7, 9, 12, 13, 16, and 17.

† Manetho's numbers are in comparatively few cases reported identically by Eusebius and Africanus. The difference in a single dynasty sometimes exceeds 300 years.

Egypt above 5,000 years before the birth of our Saviour; or are we, with Poole and Wilkinson, to shorten the term by at least twenty-three centuries, and place its commencement not before B.C. 2700? Or, finally, ought we to pursue, here as elsewhere, the *juste milieu*, and give the preference on that account to the date of Lepsius, or to the earlier view of Bunsen? It might have been hoped that the monuments, studied carefully and without prejudice, would have given a decided answer to this question; but at present they appear not to have done so. While on the one hand M. Mariette stoutly asserts that they show none of Manetho's dynasties to have been contemporary, * all other Egyptologers declare that they prove contemporaneity in several instances. Mr. R. Stuart Poole asserts positively † that "kings who unquestionably belong to different dynasties are shown by the monuments to be contemporary." Sir G. Wilkinson descends to particulars. "Useskef," he says, "of the second dynasty, is found together with Soris, or Shuré, and Menkera, of the fourth dynasty, and with Osirkef and Shafré of the fifth; while some of these again occur with Shufu and others of the fourth and fifth dynasties." ‡ And again, "The ovals of the first four kings of the fifth dynasty have been found with those of the fourth dynasty;" § and "other monuments prove that the

* See the passages quoted above, pp. 25, 26.

† "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 507, col. i.

‡ Rawlinson's "Herodotus," vol. ii. Appendix to Book ii. ch. viii. sec. 9.

§ Ibid. sec. 10; p. 292, second edition.

eleventh dynasty reigned in the Thebaid at the same time" (as the sixth dynasty at Memphis);* and "that the kings of the ninth were contemporaries of the eleventh, or earliest Theban dynasty, is proved by the fact of Muntopt II. being mentioned on a stela together with the first Amun-m-he; and an Enentef, one of his predecessors, has been found with the third king of this eleventh dynasty, Muntopt I."† It is marvellous that M. Mariette, writing several years after the publication of these statements should, instead of controverting them, wholly ignore them and pass them by, as he does when he unblushingly declares: "Never have any of the savants who have set themselves to reduce Manetho's numbers succeeded in producing a single monument, from which it results that two dynasties given by him as successive were in fact contemporary."‡

For ourselves we cannot doubt that the contemporaneity asserted, more or less, by all the Egyptologers except M. Mariette, is an established fact; but the extent to which it pervades Manetho's lists is, we admit, a matter of much uncertainty. Hitherto we have seen no disproof of the views taken by Mr. Stuart Poole and Sir G. Wilkinson, according to which—Manetho's dynastic numbers being accepted

* Rawlinson's "Herodotus," sec. 11.

† Ibid. sec. 13.

‡ "Jamais aucun des savants qui se sont efforcés de raccourcir les chiffres donnés par Manéthon n'est encore parvenu à produire un seul monument d'où il resultât que deux dynasties données comme successives dans ces listes aient été contemporaines." (Quoted in Lenormant's "Manuel," vol. i. p. 324,)

—the date of Menes is brought down to about B.C. 2700. But we do not regard this date as in any sense established. There may have been more contemporaneity than even Mr. Poole and Sir G. Wilkinson suspect; and Manetho's dynastic numbers we regard as wholly uncertain. They are frequently wrong where we can test them,* and they are evidently arrived at (as a general rule) by a mere addition of the numbers of the regnal years assigned to the several kings. But as association was largely practised in Egypt, such a mode of reckoning the years of a dynasty would be certain to produce a result greatly in excess of the truth. And further, we very much doubt whether Manetho, with the best intentions, had any materials for reconstructing the chronology of the Old or Middle Empires. The Shepherd conquest of Egypt threw everything into confusion, produced a complete shipwreck of Egyptian literature and civilization.† The length of the

* For instance, Manetho assigned to the twenty-sixth dynasty 150 (Africanus), or 168 (167) years (Eusebius); but M. Mariette is able from the monuments to determine positively that the term of its continuance was but 138 years (Lenormant, p. 321). Manetho gave the twenty-fifth dynasty a duration of forty (Africanus), or forty-four years (Eusebius). M. Mariette fixes its term at fifty years (ibid.).

† M. Lenormant says: "Nous assistons donc, sous la quinzième et seizième dynastie, a un nouveau *naufrage* de la civilisation Egyptienne." ("Manuel," vol. i. p. 360.) And a little before—"Dire ce que durant ces quatre cents ans (?) l'Egypte eut à subir de bouleversements est impossible. Le seul fait qu il soit permis de donner comme certain, c'est que pas un monument de cette époque désolée n'est venu jusqu' à nous." Elsewhere he speaks

Shepherd domination was unknown when Egypt, under the eighteenth dynasty, recovered itself, and was variously estimated at 260, 350, 811, and 953 years. In reality, Egyptian chronology only begins with the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, and even then is far from exact, the best critics varying in their dates for this event by nearly 200 years. We should be inclined to place it about B.C. 1500, or a little earlier. If the Shepherd period lasted about two centuries and a half, which is the view of Canon Cook,* the Old Empire would have come to an end about B.C. 1750. That there was such an empire is, we think, clearly established; and we have no doubt that the pyramids and various tombs now existing belonged to it. But its duration can only be *guessed.* We should be inclined, on the whole, to allow it from 500 to 700 years. The establishment of a settled monarchy in Egypt, and with it of civilization, would then fall between B.C. 2450 and B.C. 2250.

This view appears to us to be more in accordance than any other with the general facts of oriental history and chronology. Its compatibility with the chronology of the Bible will be evident, if it be borne in mind that, *according to the Septuagint ver-*

of Egyptian civilization as "annihilated" (anéantie) by the Shepherd invasion (p. 363).

* See the "Speaker's Commentary," vol. i. p. 447. The arguments of this writer against a longer duration of the Shepherd dominion than "from two to three centuries"' appear to us to have great weight.

sion, the date of the deluge was certainly anterior to B.C. 3000.*

* The flint-flakes, which in western countries are indications of the most remote antiquity of which we can find any trace, have in Egypt been found together with polished stone tools "of no very remote antiquity; and Lepsius assigns some of them, found in a grave there, to about B.C. 2500. (See Evans's "Stone Implements," p. 259.) It is therefore quite possible that the Palæolithic period of the West was contemporaneous with the early Egyptian civilization.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE ANTIQUITY OF CIVILIZATION AT BABYLON.

High antiquity claimed for Babylonian civilization by some writers—View of Bunsen—Want of foundation for this view—Classical date for the foundation of Babylon, B. C. 2230—Views of Berosus agree nearly—Septuagint date for the kingdom of Nimrod, B.C. 2567—Assyrian date of B.C. 2286—General conclusion from the cuneiform inscriptions and Berosus combined—From the inscriptions only—Character of the civilization—Architecture—Implements—Pottery—Writing—Engraving of hard stones—Dresses—Progress made in the different arts unequal.

THE advocates of an extreme antiquity for the commencement of civilization and of settled monarchy in Egypt have sometimes endeavoured to bolster up their cause by alleging an equal or even a greater antiquity for the kingdom and civilization of the Babylonians. It was evident to them that the world at large would not be persuaded that a single country stood in an entirely exceptional position; and that, while elsewhere the dawn of history could nowhere be dated much before B.C. 2000, in Egypt existing records carried us back a thousand, two thousand, or even three thousand years earlier. Accordingly the effort was made to find at least one other

country which might keep Egypt company; and none seemed capable of being turned to such good account as Chaldea or Babylonia. Scripture spoke of a "kingdom" as set up in Babylon * at a remoter period than its first notice of a kingdom in Egypt. Very curious and remarkable ruins of vast size and apparently great age were known to exist in the region; and, above all, it was certain that the Babylonians themselves, when they first came into contact with the Greeks, laid claim to an antiquity as great or greater than that which was claimed for themselves by the Egyptians. A good case, it was thought, could be made out of these data; and the early origin of civilization and settled government in Mesopotamia, resting on its own grounds of proof, would, it was concluded with reason, tend strongly to support the theory of an extreme antiquity for the same things in Egypt.

The best representative of the school of writers to whom we allude is the late Baron Bunsen. This learned scholar, but overbold speculator, having laid it down in the earlier part of his great work upon Egypt, that the commencement of monarchy there was about B.C. 3600, when he came to speak of Babylon, boldly asserted that a Chaldæan kingdom was established there not much later than B.C. 4000, and even hinted at the earlier existence in the country of a Turanian monarchy, for the foundation of which the latest date that could be reasonably

* Gen. x. 10. Monarchy in Egypt is first noticed in ch. xii. 15—20.

assigned was B.C. 7000!* In another place† the "Chaldæan era" in Babylon was definitely fixed to the year B.C. 3784, as if trustworthy materials existed for a complete and exact chronology at this early period!

It is difficult to understand on what grounds of proof this date of B.C. 3784 was supposed to rest. Some authorities‡ spoke of a Chaldæan dynasty as having reigned at Babylon for two hundred and twenty-five years anterior to a date which probably corresponded to about B.C. 2286. These numbers, if viewed as historical, produce for the foundation of the Chaldæan monarchy, not B.C. 3784, but B.C. 2511—nearly 1300 years later. A skilful manipulation of the authorities from whom we obtain Berosus' numbers might raise this date by about two hundred and thirty years;§ but whence the other thousand are to be obtained it is very difficult to understand. We *suppose* they come from the dynasty of eighty-six kings, generally regarded as mythical, whose joint reigns covered, according to

* See "Egypt's Place in Universal History," vol. iv. p. 479; and for the establishment of a Chaldæan monarchy in Babylonia not much after B.C. 4000, see the same work, vol. iii. p. 451, vol. iv. p. 411, and vol. v. p. 77.

† Ibid. vol. iii. p. 361, "There exists *a strict chronology* for the Babylonian empire dating back to the year 3784 B.C."

‡ As Syncellus ("Chronograph.," p. 169).

§ Dr. Brandis calculated B.C. 2458 as the first year of Berosus' second or Median dynasty ("Rerum Assyriar. Temp. Emendata." p. 17). If we were to add to this the 225 years of Syncellus, we should obtain B.C. 2683 for the commencement of monarchy in Babylon. If an allowance were made for the reign of Pul, and 234 years (margin) were adopted instead of 224 (text) for the second dynasty, the date might be raised to about B.C. 2743.

Berosus, the space of 34,080 years, though how they are got out of this number,* or why this dynasty should be accounted historical, surpasses our powers of conjecture. As for the still earlier Turanian dynasty, to which we are invited to assign the date of B.C. 8000, or B.C. 7000 at the latest, we fail to see on what scrap of historical evidence it is based. Apparently, it rests wholly upon two arbitrary assumptions: one, that the Deluge happened exactly ten thousand years before the Christian era; and another, that the generations between Noah and Nimrod represent—each of them—periods of a thousand years.

Putting aside these wild and baseless speculations, let us now inquire what history, worthy of the name, actually says with regard to the antiquity of civilization and settled government in Babylon.

The classical accounts, as it has been often shown,† fixed the era of the foundation of Babylon at B.C. 2230, or a very little earlier. Berosus, by a sudden change‡ from exaggerated to unexag-

* The "years" of this dynasty have been regarded by some as "months;" but so counted they would amount to 2840 lunar, or 2756 solar years.

† See the author's "Herodotus," vol. i. essay vi. sect. 3, note 4, and compare the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," vol. xv. p. 7 et seq.

‡ The dynasties of Berosus are arranged as follows:—

1st Dynasty	. . .	86 kings	. . . 34,080 years.
2d "	. . .	8 "	. . . 224 (234) years.
3d "	. . .	11 "	. . . 48 (?) years,
4th "	. . .	49 "	. . . 458 years.
5th "	. . .	9 "	. . . 245 years.
6th "	. . .	45 "	. . . 526 years.

See Euseb., "Chron. Can.," part i. c. 4.

gerated numbers, implied a belief that real human history had its commencement at Babylon, at a date which may have been as late as B.C. 2286, and cannot well have been earlier than B.C. 2458.* The Septuagint numbers indicate for the establishment of Nimrod's kingdom some such date as B.C. 2567. The Hebrew numbers lower this date by about 225 years. All these accounts *agree* in assigning the foundation of the Babylonian monarchy to the third millennium before the Christian era—B.C. 3000—2000; and all but one place it in the latter half of that millennium B.C. 2500—2000. The extreme limits of difference in the several accounts do not much exceed three centuries, the highest date being B.C. 2567, and the lowest B.C. 2230, or 337 years later.

A notice in the annals of Asshur-bani-pal, the son of Esarhaddon (about B.C. 651), tells of the invasion of Babylonia by an Elamitic king 1,635 years earlier,† and appears to imply the existence in that country of a settled government and of great cities at the time of the invasion, or about B.C. 2286.

The general conclusions to be drawn from the

* The date B.C. 2286 is obtained by allowing twenty-eight years for the reign of Pul, who preceded Tiglath-Pileser, and thus obtaining as the last year of Berosus' sixth dynasty B.C. 775. To obtain B.C. 2458, we must omit the reign of Pul, and accept the conjecture of Gutschmid and Brandis, that the time which Berosus assigned to the third dynasty was 258, and not 48 years.

† See "Records of the Past," vol. i. p. 88, and compare Lenormant, "Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol. ii. p. 24.

entire series of Babylonian and Assyrian remains recently exhumed in Mesopotamia are the following. Babylon was conquered by the Assyrians in or about the year B.C. 1300,* and from that time until the revolt of Nabopolassar (about B.C. 610), was a secondary power, sometimes subject to Assyria, sometimes in revolt, but never dominant over any wide extent of country. Her greatness was in times anterior and in times subsequent to this period. With the subsequent period, that of the later Babylonian empire B.C. 610—538, we have in this place nothing to do. Our business is with the earlier one. Babylon, before the Assyrian conquest of B.C. 1300, had been for a long time a very great power. Recent research has recovered the names of at least fifty-five monarchs† who bore sway in the country anterior to B.C. 1300. Of these fifty-five names twenty are thought to belong to a single dynasty—the dynasty which ruled immediately before the Assyrian conquest, and to which Berosus, who called it Arabian, assigned the duration of 245 years. It commenced with a king named Khammurabi, who dug canals,‡ built palaces and temples, and left numerous memorials which

* Sennacherib places the conquest 600 years before his own recovery of the city, which was in B.C. 703.

† See the "Notes on the Early History of Assyria and Babylonia," recently published by Mr. George Smith (London, 1872).

‡ On the doings of Khammurabi see M. Ménant's work, entitled, "Inscriptions de Kammourabi, Roi de Babylone," published at Paris in 1863; and compare the present writer's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. pp. 188, 189, second edition, and Oppert's "Expédition en Mésopotamie," vol. i. pp. 267, 268.

remain to the present day. A bilingual inscription, which he set up in Babylonia, exists in the museum of the Louvre, and has been translated by M. Ménant and Mr. Fox Talbot.* Khammurabi probably ascended the throne about B.C. 1545, and was succeeded by his son, Samshu-iluna, some twenty or thirty years later. His immediate predecessor was an Elamite monarch, Kudur-Mabuk, who has been sometimes identified with the Chedor-Laomer (Kudur-Lagamar) of Scripture,† but who was probably a different personage. This king, who, together with his son Rim-agu, or Ri-agu, exercised supremacy over the greater part of Southern Mesopotamia for the space of about thirty years, must have reigned from about B.C. 1575 to 1545. Previously to the conquest of Babylonia by Kudur-Mabuk, the country is thought to have been divided up among a number of petty kingdoms,‡ which were frequently at war with one another, as those of Agadi (or Accad), of Karrak, Erech, Ur, and Larsa. The monarchs of this period have Semitic names. It is difficult to form any estimate of the length of time which their reign covered. The number and

* M. Ménant's translation will be found in the work quoted in the last note. Mr. Fox Talbot's latest version is published in the "Records of the Past," vol. i. pp. 7, 8.

† This identification was first made by Sir H. Rawlinson. Chronology is against it, since we can scarcely bring the date of Abraham so low as B.C. 1575—1545. Otherwise it would be very tempting to conclude that Kudur-Mabuk=Chedor-Laomer, and that his son Rim-agu, or Ri-agu, was the Scriptural Arioch. Ri-agu was King of Larsa, which is probably the same as Ellasar.

‡ So Mr. George Smith (see his "Notes" quoted above).

succession of the names hitherto obtained would seem to indicate a period of from 250 to 300 years; but there is no certainty that the list of names is in any case complete, and future discoveries may require the period to be enlarged considerably. It is quite possible that the 458 years assigned by Berosus to the dynasty immediately preceding the Arabs * may represent the combined Semitic and Elamitic periods, in which case we should have to place the commencement of the Semitic period a little before B.C. 2000.†

We have not, however, reached as yet the earliest date to which the Babylonian remains carry us. The Semitic is preceded by a Turanian period, during which there is the same division of the country among several distinct kingdoms, which we have noted as obtaining under the Semites. The seats of empire are now Babylon, Ur, Eridu, and Zerghul, the influence of Babylon and Ur preponderating. A space of about a century and a half is required by the list of names which have been recovered; but again it is to be noted that this space is merely a minimum, and that fresh discoveries may at any time require us to enlarge it. There is, however, no reason to suppose that the enlargement required will be very great, or that we need allow for the Turanian period indicated by the monuments a longer duration of time than that which Berosus

* See above, p. 36, note.

† The addition of 458 years to B.C. 1545, the probable first year of the fifth (Arab) dynasty would produce the date B.C. 2003.

gave to his first and second historical dynasties. This space is unfortunately doubtful, being according to one estimate 282; according to another 482, or even 492 years.* If we accept the largest of these numbers, we bring the commencement of the Babylonian kingdom to about B.C. 2500, or a little later; if we take the smallest, we reduce the date by 210 years.

This is the conclusion which seems to follow from a combination of the monumental history with the scheme of Berosus. From the monuments *alone* we should not be obliged to carry back the *origines* of Babylon further than about B.C. 2025.†

It remains to consider briefly the character of the civilization which appears to have existed in Babylonia at this period (B.C. 2300—1300). The remains discovered belong to the entire space, to the early or Turanian time (B.C. 2300—2000), no less than to the Semitic period (B.C. 2000—1575), the Elamitic (B.C. 1575—1545), and the Arabian (B.C. 1545—1300). It is a civilization which was at no time very advanced.‡ The buildings were of brick, partly

* Two hundred and eighty-two, according to the *margin* of the Armenian Eusebius; 482, according to the conjectural emendation of Brandis (see p. 188, note); 492, if this emendation is combined with the *marginal* number for the second (Median) dynasty.

† This is allowing three centuries for the Semitic, and a century and a-half for the previous Turanian period. For the former the lists give about twelve consecutive names; for the latter, six. The allowance of twenty-five years for a reign is *ample*.

‡ For further details on this subject see the present writer's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. pp. 71–100, and compare Loftus, "Chaldæa and Susiana," pp. 164–192, and the "As. Soc. Journal," vol. xv.

sun-dried, partly baked; the great mass of the structure was usually of the former, the external casing of the latter material. Sometimes buildings were composed entirely of unbaked bricks, in which case it was usual to interpose, at intervals of four or five feet, a layer of reed-matting, which protected the crude brick from the weather, and retarded disintegration. The chief edifices were temples. In these the pyramidical form was, as a general rule, affected; but, instead of the slope being completed, the temple rose in a number of upright stages, which were not fewer than three, and may occasionally have amounted to seven. External ornamentation was by buttresses, by half-columns, by shallow stepped recesses, and sometimes by a patterning of terra-cotta cones. In the most elaborate façade which is left, we are told that "nothing can be more plain, more rude, or in fact more unsightly, than the decoration employed upon this front; but it is this very aspect, this very ugliness, which vouches for the originality of the style."* The column is used; but it is without cornice, capital, base, or diminution of shaft, "in groups of seven *half*-columns repeated seven times—*the rudest perhaps which were ever reared*, but built of moulded semicircular bricks, and securely bonded to the wall."† The arch occurs, but only in doorways of no great width, and scarcely as a decorative feature. It is, however, believed‡ that the great

* Loftus, "Chaldæa and Susiana," p. 175.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. p. 181 and p. 183, note.

chambers, which were sometimes above thirty-feet wide, were vaulted either with brick or with a mass of gypsum-plaster. Altogether, the architectural efforts of the early Babylonian people must be pronounced in the highest degree rude and primitive. The heavy massiveness of the walls, the coarseness of the material, the absence of ornamentation or its mean character, tell of a time when art was in its infancy,* when ideas of beauty were undeveloped, and utility was all in all. So far as architecture goes, the Babylonians of B. C. 2300—2000 were not in a more advanced condition than the Mexicans before the Spanish invasion.

Another indication of extreme rudeness and *incipient* civilization is to be found in the implements of the period, which are entirely either of stone or bronze.† No iron implement has been found, though some may have existed, since iron occurs among the materials of personal ornaments. The weapons of the Babylonians, their spear-heads and arrow-heads, were of bronze; their tools and implements, such as hammers, hatchets, adzes, knives, sickles, nails, were either of bronze or stone. The workmanship of the

* Mr. Loftus says, "The entire absence of cornice, capital, base, or diminution of shaft, so characteristic of other columnar architecture, and the peculiar and original disposition of each group in rows like palm logs, suggest the type from which they sprang. *It is only to be compared with the style adopted by the aboriginal inhabitants* of other countries, and was evidently derived from the construction of wooden edifices" (p. 175).

† See the present writer's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. pp. 95—98, second edition.

stone implements is somewhat more advanced than that of those very primitive ones which have been found in the drift; but it is in no degree more skilled than that of the ordinary stone celts of Western and Northern Europe, which, until the examination of the drift and cave remains, were regarded as the most ancient products of human art in our quarter of the globe. The bronze implements have been cast in clay moulds, and are not ill-shaped. They are generally, no doubt, of later date than the stone ones; but their position in the remains appears to indicate that the two materials were, during a long term of years, in use together.

In pottery, the early Babylonians exhibit some considerable skill and ingenuity. Clay was a material with which they must have been familiar from their original settlement in the country, and which, from the time when they first fashioned it into bricks,* they must have perceived to be adapted also for other purposes. In their earliest fictile art, there is neither elegance of form nor excellence of material. The clay used is of a coarse kind; it is mixed with chopped straw to give it cohesion; and it is roughly moulded by the hand into the required lamp or drinking vessel.† At a later time they learnt, or invented, the employment of the potter's wheel; they sought out and procured a finer clay, and they modelled vases, lamps, jugs, and amphoræ of a form and taste not much inferior to the ordinary

* Gen. xi. 3.

† "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. pp. 91, 92.

workmanship of the Greeks. They also constructed clay coffins, remarkable for their size,* and pipes for drains, exhibiting a considerable knowledge of mechanical principles;† but it is not certain that these works were of an earlier date than B.C. 1500.

Writing was known to the Babylonians from almost the earliest times of which any traces remain to us; but the writing was of a very rude and primitive kind. The letters show strong signs of having recently emerged out of hieroglyphics;‡ they are coarsely and irregularly formed, and the sentences are of the simplest possible construction. § The inscriptions preserved in no case much exceed half-a-dozen lines, and are of a formal and stereotyped character. The civilization indicated by the writings is thus one of a primitive and undeveloped type.

In two or three respects only can it be said that the Babylonians of the first period (B.C. 2300—2000) exhibit more than a rudimentary acquaintance with the arts and appliances which go to make up what moderns understand by civilized life. Among these are especially the engraving of hard gems, and the manufacture of delicate textile fabrics. Hard stones,

* "Ancient Monarchies," vol. 1, pp. 87–89. The "dish-cover" coffins are sometimes seven feet long, by two or three feet high, and are two feet and a-half broad at the bottom. They are made in one piece.

† Ibid. p. 90.

‡ Ibid. pp. 64, 65.

§ They usually run much as follows:—"Urukh, King of Ur, and king of the land of Accad, has built the temple of Belus." "The signet of Urukh, the pious chief, King of Ur, high-priest of Niffer." By the time of Khammurabi, the legends are longer; but the constructions are scarcely more elaborate.

well cut, bearing upon them representations of human forms fairly rendered, belong to almost the very earliest period whereto the Babylonian monuments reach ; * and the figures upon these stones are clothed in dresses which are as elaborate as those of Nebuchadnezzar's age.† It would seem that the art of working gems, of cutting them into shape with a wheel or disk, and then engraving them with an iron implement dipped in emery powder, must have been a very early discovery of the Babylonian people. They must also, at a very remote date, have been able to weave linen, muslin, or silk, of a fine texture, and to construct dresses ‡ of these materials scarcely less elaborate than those worn in their palmiest days by the Egyptians and Assyrians. Altogether, what strikes us most with respect to the early civilization of the Babylonians is its *unevenness*. Instead of that general diffusion over all the various departments of art and manufacture whereto we are accustomed, there was the most marked difference of degree, at one and the same time, with respect to different branches. Dress was elaborate, ornaments were

* The signet cylinders of Urukh, and his son Ilgi (or Dungi), two of the earliest kings of the first, or Turanian period, have been recovered by explorers. They are of the character described in the text. Many others of the cylinders to be found in all museums are probably as early or earlier.

† See the author's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. p. 94; and compare Ker Porter, "Travels," vol. ii. pl. 79, fig. 6.

‡ We have an instance of the export of one such dress to a distance from Babylonia, and of the high value set upon it at a date which can scarcely be much less than B.C. 1500, in the story of Achan (Josh. vii. 21).

tastefully wrought,* seal-engraving was carried to a high pitch of perfection, furniture was in some cases artistic,† while architecture stood at a low level, pottery was rude and inelegant, and stone was still the ordinary material for tools and implements. The general result indicates the combination of much natural intelligence with a somewhat brief term of experience, which has precluded the application of the natural gifts equally in all directions. The predominant aim has been rather to gratify the desires of the great and powerful than to ameliorate the condition of the working classes. Even the former object has been but partially accomplished, as if there had scarcely been time for thought to employ itself on more than a limited number of subjects. The civilization reached is, on the whole, inferior to that of the early Egyptians. It seems to be, in its main features, independent of Egypt. Whether it is a little earlier or a little later, can scarcely be determined; but, on the whole, we are inclined to assign to Egypt the palm of antiquity.

* "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. p. 98.

† Ibid. p. 94.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE DATE AND CHARACTER OF PHŒNICIAN CIVILIZATION.

Phœnician claim to have originated civilization—Claim disallowed—Yet the civilization was among the earliest—Indications of it in Homer—In Herodotus—In Scripture—Existing Phœnician remains—Phœnician glass—Phœnician dyes—Phœnician music—Chief glory of the Phœnicians, their invention of (exclusively) alphabetic writing—Spread of the writing—Date of Phœnician civilization—Of the founding of Tyre—Of Sidon—All requirements satisfied by such a date as B.C. 1600—1500.

ONE of the earliest Oriental civilizations was that of Phœnicia. Philo of Byblos, a Syro-Phœnician Greek, who wrote in the early part of the second century after Christ, and professed to present his countrymen with a translation of an old Phœnician history composed by a native priest, called Sanchoniathon, claimed for Phœnicia a precedence over every other known nation in respect of science, art, and civilization generally. According to him, Thoth (Taautus), the Egyptian god of learning, whom the Greeks identified with Mercury, was a Phœnician, who had instructed the Egyptians in theology. Osiris had come from Egypt to Phœnicia, and having there studied and been initiated into the native mysteries, had carried back to his own coun-

trymen the knowledge of letters, and invented the threefold system of Egyptian writing. Kronos, a Phœnician king, had introduced civilization into Greece, and established Athené there as queen of Attica. This same monarch was the progenitor of the Jewish nation through his only son, Jeoud. Civilization in all its branches had originated in Phœnicia. Here masonry, agriculture, fishing, navigation, astronomy, music, metallurgy had been discovered and first practised. From Phœnicia the stream of knowledge had flowed out to other countries, which had all derived from this source their art and science, their writing and literature, their religion and theosophy.

The claims of Philo of Byblos, or Sanchoniathon, whichever was the real author of the work in question, which is largely quoted by Eusebius, most certainly exceed the truth. As Mr. Kenrick well observes, "If it be safe to pronounce in any case on priority of knowledge and civilization, it is in awarding to Egypt precedence over Phœnicia."* But still, though Phœnician authors might exaggerate the antiquity and early civilization of their country, they must undoubtedly have had a basis of truth to rest upon. It would have been ridiculous to claim priority over all other races and nations, unless in general repute their antiquity was regarded as considerable. We can entertain no reasonable doubt that they were *among* the nations whose origin went back the furthest, and who might thus be considered

* See Kenrick's "Phœnicia," p. 286.

entitled to compete for the palm of antiquity without putting forth a wholly absurd pretension.

And the conclusion which we should thus draw from the claim set up in the work ascribed to Sanchoniathon is borne out by various other considerations. In the earliest Greek literature—the Homeric poems—whose date we cannot bring ourselves to place later than about B.C. 1000, the Phœnicians are already regarded as among the great nations of the earth, and the most advanced in art and civilization. "It is to this people," says Mr. Gladstone,* "that we must look as the established merchants, hardiest navigators, and furthest explorers of those days. To them alone, as a body, in the whole Homeric world of flesh and blood, does Homer give the distinctive epithet of 'ship-renowned.' He accords it, indeed, to the airy Phæacians; but in all probability that element of their character is borrowed from the Phœnicians; and, if so, the reason of the derivation can only be that the Phœnicians were for that age the type of a nautical people. To them only does he assign the epithets which belong to the knavery of trade, *polypaipaloi* and *troktai*. When we hear of their ships in Egypt or in Greece, the circumstance is mentioned as if their coming was in the usual course of their commercial operations." The Mediterranean of Homer's time, and of the still earlier age which he strives to depict, is, in fact, a "Phœnician lake." The Phœnicians have settlements in various parts of

* "Homer, and the Homeric Age," vol. i. p. 220.

it, and trade with all the countries whose shores it washes. No other nation interferes with them, or even seeks to share in their profits. They are the established carriers between land and land, and supply to each the foreign commodities that it requires.

This early nautical skill and addiction to commerce is celebrated by the historians no less than by the poets. Herodotus, who places the Trojan War * about B.C. 1250, represents the Phœnicians as trading with Argos several generations earlier, and as then offering for sale on the shores of the Peloponnese the wares of Egypt and Assyria.† At a date at least as remote he regards the Phœnicians as slave-dealers who kidnapped defenceless persons in the countries to which they had access, and sold them to the dwellers in other Mediterranean regions.‡

The Jewish historians assign to Sidon a very remote antiquity,§ and attest the great maritime knowledge and naval skill of the Phœnicians at the time when their own people first developed a tendency to commercial speculation.‖ This, however, was not till about B.C. 1000, a date long subsequent to the times of which Homer and Herodotus bear witness.

* See the "Vita Homeri," sec. 38; and compare the "History," ii. 145.

† Herod. i. 1.

‡ Ibin. ii. 54.

§ See Gen. x. 15, where Sidon is made the first-born of Canaan; and compare the mention of "great Sidon" in Joshua (xi. 8).

‖ 1 Kings ix. 27; 2 Chron. viii. 18.

Besides their pre-eminency in nautical matters the Phœnicians were also in those early ages proficients in various elegant and ornamental arts. In Phœnicia were produced, according to Homer, the noblest works of metallic skill, and the choicest specimens of embroidery. The prize assigned by Achilles for the foot-race at the funeral of Patrocles was,*

> "A bowl of solid silver, deftly wrought,
> That held six measures, and in beauty far
> Surpassed whatever else the world could boast;
> Since men of Sidon, skilled in glyptic art,
> Had made it, and Phœnician mariners
> Had brought it with them over the dark sea."

The choicest gift that Menelaus could offer to Telemachus when he took his departure from his Court is described as follows† :—

> "Of all the chatteis that my house contains,
> The noblest and most beautiful, a bowl
> Wrought deftly, all of silver, but with lips
> Gold-sprinkled, by Hephæstus shaped and framed,
> Which Phædimus once gave me, Sidon's king."

When Hecuba was anxious to conciliate Athené by a costly and precious offering, she went to her wardrobe, and selected from the many vestments there in store, which were all of them

> "The cunning work of Sidon's well-skilled dames,"‡

one of special and extraordinary beauty,

* Hom. "Il." xxiii. 741—744.
† Hom. "Od." iv. 614—618.
‡ Hom. "Il." vi. 289.

"Fairest of all
In its rich broidery, and amplest too;
Which blazed as 'twere a star, and lowest lay
Of all the garments."*

Of a very similar character were the artistic works which Hiram, the Phœnician artificer lent by the King of Tyre to Solomon, constructed at Jerusalem for the ornamentation of the Temple. Hiram was "skilful to work in gold, and in silver, in brass, in iron, in stone, and in timber, in purple, in blue, and in fine linen (white?), and in crimson; also to grave any manner of graving."† He cast for Solomon, "in the plain of Jordan, in the clay ground between Succoth and Zarthan,"‡ the two great bronze pillars, called Jachin and Boaz, each of them twenty-seven feet high, and with capitals five and a half feet high,§ which stood before the Temple on either side of the porch, adorned with pomegranates, and "nets of checker work and wreaths of chain work,"‖ real marvels of glyptic skill! He made, moreover, a "molten sea,"¶ or great bronze laver, supported on twelve oxen, of the same material, together with ten movable lavers, that went on wheels, and were ornamented with lions, oxen, and cherubim.** The lesser vessels and implements

* Hom. "Il." vi. 292–295.

† See 2 Chron. ii. 14.

‡ 1 Kings vii. 46. Compare the "Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund," for January, 1875, p. 31.

§ 1 Kings vii. 15, 16.

‖ Ibid. verse 17.

¶ Ibid. verse 23.

** Ibid. verses 27–39.

used in the service, "the pots, the shovels, and the basons," are likewise expressly said to have been his work.* We may reasonably conclude that he had also the general superintendence of the internal decoration of the Temple, the carving of cedar and fir and olive, and the covering of the carved work with gold, as well as the incrustation of the wood-work in places with marbles and precious stones.† Whether we are to attribute to him, or to others his compatriots, the entire series of Solomon's works—the house of the forest of Lebanon,‡ with its "four rows of cedar pillars and cedar beams upon the pillars," the throne of judgment, carved in ivory and overlaid with the purest gold, guarded by lions upon its six steps,§ and the "porch for the throne where he might judge"‖—is, perhaps, doubtful; but the predominant judgment of the best critics appears to be that in all these and other works of the time we have, if not Phœnician workmanship, at any rate Phœnician influence.¶ The general preference of wood to stone for building, and especially of cedar; the ornamentation by pomegranates and gourds and palms and lilies, Syrian products; the use of isolated pillars, etc., all point to Phœnicia,

* Ibid. verse 45. Compare 2 Chron. iv. 16, where we are told "The pots also, and the shovels, and the fleshhooks, *and all their instruments*, did Huram make to King Solomon for the house of the Lord of bright brass."

† See 1 Chron. xxix. 2, and 2 Chron. iii. 6.

‡ 1 Kings vii. 2.

§ Ibid. x. 18–20; 2 Chron. ix. 17–19.

‖ 1 Kings vii. 7.

¶ See Kenrick, "Phœnicia," pp. 251–253.

rather than to Egypt or Assyria, as the country which furnished the great Jewish monarch with his models, and supplied the "motives" or ideas of his various works and constructions.

The exact character and degree of excellency of the architecture and glyptic or plastic art which the Phœnicians practised is, to some extent, open to question. The works of art still in existence, which can be ascribed with even a fair degree of probability to the Phœnicians, are scanty in the extreme; and even if they were more numerous, we should still be scarcely justified in drawing any positive conclusions from data that are so uncertain. A few rock tombs of doubtful antiquity, and a single sarcophagus of an Egyptian type,* constitute pretty nearly all the remains that the country itself has hitherto furnished; and upon these it is evidently not safe to build any definite theory. If we might accept confidently the view of Mr. Layard,† that the entire series of embossed and engraved vessels which he discovered at Nimrud are "the work of Phœnician artists, brought expressly from Tyre, or carried away amongst the captives when their cities were taken by the Assyrians," we should have perhaps sufficient grounds for forming a judgment. The dishes, plates, bowls, and cups in question are in excellent taste, elegant in shape, delicately and chastely ornamented with fanciful designs representing conventional forms,

* On the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar, see the article on Zidon in Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. iii, p. 1850.

† "Nineveh and Babylon," p. 192.

or sometimes men and animals, and skilfully embossed by a process which is still employed by modern silversmiths.* Their positive attribution to Phœnicia would justify the highest estimate that has ever yet been formed of Phœnician artistic power and skill in metallurgy. But it must not be forgotten or concealed that it is conjecture only which assigns them to Phœnicia, and that there is perhaps equal reason for regarding them as the work of native Assyrian artists.†

Besides navigation, architecture, metallurgy, and embroidery, the Phœnicians excelled also at a very early date in the manufacture of glass, in dyeing, and perhaps in music. The Romans of imperial times believed that the honour of actually inventing glass belonged to the Phœnician city of Sidon;‡ and though in this they were probably mistaken, since glass was known in Egypt as early as the Pyramid period,§ yet there can be no doubt that the Sidonians produced glass at a remote date, and were proficients in its manufacture. "They knew the effect of an addition of manganese to the grit of sand and soda in making the glass clearer. They used the blowpipe, the lathe, and the graver, and cast mirrors of glass. They must also have been acquainted with the art of imitating precious stones, and colour-

* "Nineveh and Babylon," p. 193, note.

† See the author's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. pp. 459, 460; first edition.

‡ See Plin. "H. N." xxxvi. 65.

§ Rawlinson's "Herodotus," vol. ii. p. 291, second edition; Wilkinson's "Ancient Egyptians," vol. iii. p. 88.

ing glass by means of metallic oxides. The 'pillar of emerald,' which Herodotus speaks of (ii. 44) in the Temple of Hercules at Tyre, 'shining brightly in the night,' can hardly have been anything else than a hollow cylinder of green glass, in which, as at Gades, a lamp burnt perpetually." * What was the amount of excellence whereto they attained is uncertain; but the fame of the Sidonian glass in early times would seem to imply that they surpassed the artists of both Assyria † and Egypt.

The art of dyeing textile fabrics with the juice of the *Murex trunculus* and *Buccinum lapillus* ‡ is notoriously one which the Phœnicians carried to a high pitch of perfection; and "Tyrian purple" was everywhere regarded as the most beautiful of all known hues. Various tints were produced by different modes of manipulating the dye, which, according to the process used, made the fabric whereto it was applied scarlet, bright crimson, purple, or even blue. The "crimson and purple and blue," in which Hiram was skilful to work (2 Chron. ii. 14), were probably all produced by the native dyers from the shell-fish in question. So peculiarly Phœnician was the manufacture considered, that the ordinary colour resulting from the dye received the name of *phœnix* or *phœnikeos* (Lat. *puniceus*), *i. e.*, "the Phœnician

* Kenrick, "Phœnicia," p. 249.

† On Assyrian glass, see Layard, "Nineveh and Babylon," pp. 196, 197, and the remarks of Sir D. Brewster in the same work, pp. 674–676.

‡ This subject is well treated by Mr. Kenrick ("Phœnicia," pp. 237–247, and 255–259).

colour." Metallic and vegetable agents were, no doubt, also employed; but the use of the shellfish predominated, and alone conferred on the Phœnician dyers their great reputation.

The Phœnicians of Sidon were declared by their native historian * to have invented music. As the invention belongs to antediluvian times (Gen. iv. 21), this claim must of course be disallowed; but the musical taste of the people is sufficiently indicated by the fact that they gave their name to instruments, which the Greeks received from them and retained in use for centuries. A particular kind of lyre or cithern was known, as least as early as the time of Herodotus,† by the name of *phœnix*. It was usually enclosed by the two horns of an oryx, or large antelope, which were probably joined near their upper ends by a tranverse bar of wood, from which the strings were carried to the bottom. Another instrument was known as the *lyro-phœnix* or *lyro-phœnikion*,‡ which differed probably from the *phœnix* by having at its base the shell of a tortoise, or some other hollow contrivance, intended to act as a sounding-board. It is not unlikely that the scientific cultivation of music among the Jews, which belongs especially to the time of David and Solomon,§ was a

* Sanchoniathon, ed. Orelli, p. 32.

† Herod. iv. 192.

‡ The lyro-phœnix (*λυροφοῖνιξ*) is mentioned by Athenæus ("Deipnosoph." 175 D., 183 D.; the lyro-phœnikion (*λυροφοινίκιον*) by Pollux ("Onomast." iv. 59).

§ See "Dictionary of the Bible," ad. voc. "Music," vol. ii. p. 443, col. i.

result of the close and friendly intercourse which then existed between the court of Jerusalem and that of Tyre.*

But the great glory of the Phœnicians, and the plainest mark of their early civilization, is their invention of alphabetic writing. Other nations—notably the Egyptians and Babylonians—had anticipated them in the invention of a method whereby articulate sounds were represented to the eye by forms and figures. But the systems which these nations introduced and employed were not alphabetic; they were cumbrous and complicated, unapt for ordinary or extensive use, and such as to require for their mastery a special and almost professional training.† Both employed a large number of *ideographs*, or signs of ideas; both used numerous *determinatives*;‡ both had a redundancy of signs for

* See 2 Sam. v. 11; 1 Kings v. 1—18, ix. 11—27; 1 Chron. xxii. 4; 2 Chron. ii. 3—16, viii. 18, ix. 21.

† M. Lenormant well observes, with respect to the Egyptian writing—"Elle constitute sans contredit le plus perfectionné des systèmes d'écriture primitifs qui commencerent par le pur idéographisme, mais combien ce système est encore grossier, confus, et imparfait! Que d'obscurités et d'incertitudes dans la lecture! Que de chances de confusions et d'erreurs, *dont une étude très-prolongée et une grande pratique pouvaient seules préserver!* Quelle extrême complication." (*Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 100.) And he concludes that a system of writing so complicated, the mastery of which required so long an apprenticeship, could not be very widely spread among the mass of the people, but must have been the almost exclusive possession of professional scribes, who formed a class apart from the rest of the nation.

‡ *Determinatives* are signs prefixed to a word, or added after it, in order to show what kind of word it is; whether, for instance, it

one and the same sound; both employed certain signs sometimes in one, sometimes in another manner.* In one respect the Babylonian and Egyptian methods differed, and the latter approached to the verge of being an alphabetic system. The Babylonian characters did not represent the elementary sounds of human articulation,† but stood for complete syllables, for a consonant with a vowel, either before or after, or for the combination of two consonants with a vowel between them; the Egyptians proceeded beyond this; they went so far as to decompose the syllable, and possessed signs which were "letters" in the exact modern sense. But they never wrote with these signs exclusively. Their system was from first to last a jumble, in which symbolic and determinative signs were mixed up with phonetic ones, and in which the phonetic ones were of two classes, alphabetic and syllabic, in which, moreover, the ideographic signs might take an accidental phonetic value at the commencement of certain words, and the alphabetic and syllabic characters might also be employed ideographically. It was left for the Phœnicians to seize on the one feature of Egyptian writing, which was capable of universal

is the name of a god, of a man, of a place, of a month, of a metal, etc. For their use in Egyptian, see Lepsius's "Alphabet Hieroglyphique," Planche, A., Nos. 5 and 6. For their use in Babylonian and Assyrian, see Oppert's "Expédition Scientifique en Mésopotamie," vol. ii. pp. 88—92.

* That is, sometimes phonetically, sometimes ideographically.

† If there is an exception, it is in the case of the vowels, which, being syllables, had signs assigned to them.

application to disentangle it from the confused jumble of heterogeneous principles with which it was bound up, and to form a system of writing in which there should be no intermixture of any other method. To do this was to take a step in advance greater than any which had been previously taken; it was, as has been well said, "to consummate the union of the written and spoken word, to emancipate once for all the spirit of man from the swaddling-clothes of primitive symbolism, and to allow it at length to have its full and free development, by giving it an instrument worthy of it, perfect in respect of clearness, of elasticity, and of convenience for use." *

The complicated and cumbrous systems of the Babylonians and Egyptians could never have become general or have been of any great service to mankind. The method adopted by the Phœnicians rapidly proved its excellence by showing itself fruitful and overspreading the earth. It is one of the chief marks of genius to see to the roots of things, to discern the one in the many, and to grasp the *simple* principle, which is alone of universal applicability. This mark of genius the Phœnician showed. The form of writing which, according to a universal tradition, † was invented by them, possessed the quality of simplicity in perfection, and was no sooner discovered that it began to spread. Adopted readily by the

* Lenormant, "Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne," vol. iii. p. 110.

† "Plin. "H. N." v. 12; Mela. i. 12; Diod. Sic. v. 24; Tacit. "Ann." xi. 14; Lucan. "Pharsalia," iii. 220, 221; Clem. Alex. "Strom." i. 16; etc.

neighbouring nations, it was soon carried far and wide over the Asiatic continent, and under slightly modified forms is found to have been in use from the shores of the Indian Ocean to those of the Euxine, and from the Ægean to the remotest parts of Hindostan. Nor was it content with these conquests. It crossed the sea which separates Asia from Europe, was carried to Crete, to Thera, to Greece, to Sicily, to Italy, and to Spain. It also made a lodgment on the African seaboard, and ere many centuries were gone by, prevailed from the borders of Egypt to the Atlantic Ocean. Accepted by the two greatest peoples of antiquity—the Greeks and Romans—it passed from them to the nations of Northern Europe, and has thus become the system of almost the whole civilized world.

Such then was the character of Phœnician civilization. With regard to its date, we are not aware that in modern times any very remote antiquity has been claimed for it. The writers who exalt beyond all reasonable measure the antiquity of Egypt are content with a very moderate estimate for that of the Phœnicians. No traces of the Phœnician cities are found in the early Egyptian monuments, which give in great detail the geography of Syria,* and it is thought likely that the people itself did not settle on the coast of the Mediterranean, or even reach Syria, until about B.C. 2400 or 2300.† A native tradition,

* See Lenormant, "Manuel," vol. iii. p. 9.

† Ibid. p. 11.

reported by Herodotus,* assigned the building of the great Temple of Hercules (Melkarth) at Tyre, which was probably coeval with the city †, to about B.C. 2750, or from three to four centuries earlier. But it is urged that this estimate was one based on generations,‡ and that therefore it is not to be depended on. It should also be noted that authorities of considerable weight contradict the statement made to Herodotus. Josephus, for instance, says that Tyre was founded two hundred and forty years only before the building of Solomon's Temple,§ which would make the date of the settlement (according to the commonly received chronology) B.C. 1252. Again, Justin, or rather Trogus Pompeius, whom he copied, lays it down that the year of the foundation was that which immediately preceded the year of the capture of Troy,‖ which he probably placed about B.C. 1200.¶ Tyre, however, was certainly built before the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan under Joshua, since it is spoken of as a well-known place in the important work which bears Joshua's name**—

* Herod. ii. 44.

† So said the Tyrians themselves—Ἔφασαν ἅμα Τύρῳ οἰκιζομένῃ καὶ τὸ ἱρὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱδρυθῆναι. ("Herod." l.s.c.)

‡ Lenormant, "Manuel," vol. iii. p. 9.

§ "Ant. Judd." viii. 3.

‖ Justin. xviii. 3: "Post multos annos . . . . . Sidonii . . . . . navibus appulsi Tyron urbem ante annum Trojanæ cladis condiderunt."

¶ The date of Erastosthenes was B.C. 1184; that of Castor and the Parian marble B.C. 1209; that of Herodotus and Thucydides, B.C. 1250.

** Josh. xix. 29: "And then the coast turneth to Ramah, *and to the strong city of Tyre.*"

the "Domesday Book," as it has been called, of the Hebrew nation. That entrance can scarcely be dated later than B.C. 1400,* so that Tyre must certainly have existed in the fifteenth century before our era. As Sidon was, according to all accounts, considerably more ancient than Tyre, we must allow at least another century for the period of Sidonian preponderance—an estimate which will make the old Phœnician capital date from at least B.C. 1550—1500.

We do not think there are any sufficient grounds for throwing back the *origines* of the Phœnicians, or, at any rate, of Phœnician civilization, to a time anterior to this. All the necessities of the case are met by such a date as B.C. 1550. The Phœnician civilization represented by Homer *must* have existed prior to B.C. 1000, and is imagined by the poet to have been, as he represents it, two or three centuries earlier. The Jewish records do not exhibit the civilization in detail until the eleventh century B.C.; nor does the use of the phrase "Great Zidon," in Joshua,† if we regard civilization as implied in it, carry back the flourishing condition of the nation much beyond B.C. 1400. The monuments of Egypt furnish, we believe, no evidence of Phœnician art or commerce anterior to the eighteenth dynasty—B.C. 1500—1300. We are

* Bunsen and Lepsius maintain the lower date of B.C. 1280; but it is impossible to reconcile their views with the statements of Scripture.

† Josh. xi. 8.

inclined to believe that the original emigration of the Phœnicians from the shores of the Persian Gulf to those of the Mediterranean* may have taken place as far back as B.C. 1800, or even earlier; but we see no indication of their having become a commercial, or a manufacturing, or a literary people, until, at least, three centuries later. To sum up, we agree with the conclusion to which Mr. Kenrick came in 1855:—"The commencement of the period of Phœnician commercial activity cannot be historically fixed; it *may* ascend to the *sixteenth or seventeenth* century B.C.; it may be several centuries earlier."† But we incline, on the whole, to prefer the latest date which he mentions, and are disposed to regard the sixteenth century B.C. as that which saw the first appearance of the Phœnicians as a civilized and civilizing nation.

* See Herod. i. 1, vii. 89; Justin. xviii. 3, sec. 2; Strab. xvi. p. 1090; and compare the author's "Herodotus," vol. vi. pp. 196, 197.

† "Phœnicia," p. 340.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE CIVILIZATIONS OF ASIA MINOR—PHRYGIA, LYDIA, LYCIA, THE TROAS.

Claim made by the Phrygians to an extreme antiquity—Their military power, about B.C. 1300—Character of their civilization—Period which it covers, from about B.C. 900 to B.C. 565—Antiquity of the Lydian monarchy—Account of Herodotus—His third, or Mermnad dynasty—His second or Heracleid dynasty—His first dynasty, mythic—Lydian civilization not traceable further back than about B.C. 900—850—Chief features of the civilization—Coinage—Trade—Glyptic art—Tombs of the kings—Flourishing period of Lydia, from B.C. 850 to B.C. 550—Civilization of Lydia, remarkable—Beauty of the sculptures—Indications of refinement—High position of women—Early civilization of the Troas—Character of the civilization as shown by recent excavations—Leading features of Aryan civilization.

AMONG the nations which claimed to have existed from the remotest times,* and which even ventured to dispute the palm of antiquity with Egypt,† it is somewhat surprising to find the small and not very distinguished state of Phrygia. Phrygia was an inland tract, occupying the central portion of Asia Minor, which is an elevated plateau,

* See Pausan. i. 14, § 2; Apuleius, "Metaph.," xi. 5; Arrian, Fr. 46; Schol. ad Apollon. Rhod. iv. 261; Claudian, "Eutrop.," ii. 251, etc.

† Herod. ii. 2.

bounded north and south by mountain-chains, and intersected here and there by rocky ridges. From what date the Phrygian people had really been settled in this region is exceedingly uncertain. They had congeners in Thrace,* and were believed by some to have immigrated from Europe into Asia within historical memory.† But it is doubtful, on the whole, whether this migration has any solid grounds to rest upon; and quite certain that, if a fact, it must be one belonging to very remote times, long anterior to the dawn of history. The interior of Asia Minor is known as Phrygia to Homer,‡ and no hint is given by him of its inhabitants being newly come into the region. Priam had in his youth helped them when they were attacked by the Amazons, and speaks of them as if they were then (about B.C. 1300) the most powerful people of the Peninsula.§ Their own traditions appear to have made them *autochthones*, or aboriginals; and it would seem that they believed the re-peopling of the earth after the flood to have begun in their country.‖ Of course no great stress can be laid on such a tradition; but it is incompatible with any knowledge on their part of being recent immigrants into their territory.

* The Briges, whose name was another form of Phryges. (See Herod. vii. 73; Steph. Byz. ad voc. Βρίγες.)

† Xanthus Lydus said that the migration had taken place subsequently to the Trojan War (Fr. 5).

‡ "Iliad," iii. 184.

§ Ibid. ii. 185—190.

‖ Steph. Byz. ad voc. Ἰκόνιον. Compare the Phrygian coins which represent the Deluge (Mionnet, "Descriptions des Medailles," vol. iv. pp. 231—227; and "Bible Educator," vol. i. pp. 33—35.)

The civilization of the Phrygians was not of a high order. They were better known in the remoter times for their warlike qualities than for any progress which they had made in the useful or ornamental arts. Homer celebrates their martial ardour,* and the skill with which they managed their chariots,† but says nothing of their occupations in peace. Other writers note their proficiency in boxing.‡ As time went on, however, they developed a civilization, the impulse towards which may have been given from without, but which had features that were peculiar. They sculptured rock-tombs unlike any found elsewhere, and adorned them with an elegant patterning, accompanied by inscriptions.§ They invented a musical style of a stirring and martial character, which was adopted as one of their main styles by the Greeks.‖ They applied themselves, if we may believe Diodorus,¶ to nautical matters, and for the space of twenty-five years held the command of the Mediterranean Sea. One of their tribes** distinguished itself in metallurgy, and from their

* *Φόρκυς αὖ Φρύγας ἦγε καὶ Ἀσκάνιος θεοειδὴς, Τῆλ' ἐξ Ἀσκανίης. μέμασαν δ'ὑσμῖνι μάχεσθαι.* Hom. "Iliad," ii. 862, 863.

† *Φρύγας, ἀνέρας αἰολοπώλους.* "Iliad," iii. 185.

‡ Theocrit. "Idyll." xxii. 75—130; Apollon. Rhod. i. 937—954; Apollod. "Bibliothec.," ii. 5, § 9.

§ See Texier, "Asie Mineure," vol. i. p. 155; and for the inscriptions, cf. the author's "Herodotus," vol. i. p. 547, second edition.

‖ Grote, "History of Greece," vol. ii. p. 402 (ed. of 1862).

¶ Ap. Euseb. "Chron. Can.," i. 36.

** The Dactyli of Mount Ida. (See "Phorônis," Fr. 5.)

wonderful skill acquired the reputation of being magicians. In connection with their music, they composed odes and hymns, which they used in their religious services, and which must have had considerable merit, if they really "stimulated the development of lyric and elegiac composition" among the Greeks of Asia. *

It will scarcely be argued at the present day that Phrygian civilization began at a very early date. We cannot really trace the nation further back than about B.C. 1300, for their name is absent from the Bible, and from the early cuneiform and hieroglyphical inscriptions. Homer is the most ancient authority for their existence; and Homer, as above remarked, represents them as a warlike, but scarcely as a civilized, people. Their written characters are evidently derived from the Phœnician, † and were probably communicated to them at the time of their naval supremacy, or about B.C. 900—875. Their rock-sculptures are most likely later than this. The kind Midas, whose tomb and inscription still remain at Doganlu, near the ancient Cotyæum, is probably the monarch of the name whom Eusebius ‡ made a contemporary of Hezekiah (B.C. 726—697). He is, perhaps, the same with the Midas whom Herodotus mentions as the first foreigner to send offerings to Delphi; § and he possibly may be the *Mita* whom

* So Mr. Grote ("Hist of Greece," vol. ii. p. 403).
† See the author's Herodotus," l. s. c.
‡ "Chron. Can.," ii. p. 321.
§ Herod. i. 14.

Sargon speaks of as one of his West-Asian antagonists.* It is not clear that a Phrygian *monarchy* had existed very long before this. In the Homeric times no king is mentioned; and the traditional Gordias, the founder of the kingdom,† if he be a real personage, may have been the father of this Midas, and have ascended the throne about B.C. 750. The most flourishing period of Phrygia must be placed between B.C. 750 and B.C. 565. For centuries anterior to B.C. 750 it had been an important military power—probably the chief power of Asia Minor; but we have no evidence of its condition at this period, and cannot say whether it was civilized or barbarous.

The history of Lydia is carried back by ancient writers very considerably beyond that of Phrygia. According to Herodotus,‡ the country had been ruled by three dynasties in succession before its conquest by Cyrus (B.C. 554)—the first of them sprung from a certain Lydus, son of Atys; the next descended from the Grecian Hercules, and known as Heracleids; the third descended from Gyges, son of Dascylus, and known as Mermnads. To the Mermnad dynasty he assigned 170 years;§ to the Heracleids 505 years;‖ to the dynasty which

* See "Ancient Monarchies," vol. ii. p. 422, first edition, and compare Sir H. Rawlinson's note in the author's "Herodotus," vol. i. p. 131, note 6, second edition.

† Arrian, "Exp. Alex." ii. 3; Justin. xi. 7.

‡ Herod. i. 7—13.

§ This number is obtained by adding together the years assigned to the several kings. It is probably in excess, since it involves an average of thirty-four years to a reign.

‖ Herod. i. 7.

preceded the Heracleids he could assign no definite duration,—their origin was lost in the mists of antiquity, falling into the remote period when history melts into fable and legend. A settled monarchy had thus, according to the belief of Herodotus, existed in Lydia from a date at least as early as B.C. 1400; for we can scarcely allow to his first dynasty a less period than two centuries. The views of Herodotus are borne out to a certain extent by notices in other writers. Diodorus said * that the Lydians had held the command of the Mediterranean for ninety-two years—from B.C. 1182 to B.C. 1090. Xanthus, the Lydian, who wrote the history of his native country in Greek during the lifetime of Herodotus, appears by his fragments to have recognized the three dynasties of that writer,† and to have claimed for the Lydian kingdom at least as high an antiquity.‡ Homer does not throw much light on the subject. He does not use the name of "Lydians" at all; but it is generally agreed that the Mêones, whom he brings from Mount Tmolus to the assistance of Priam,§ represent the Lydian people.

* Ap. Euseb. "Chron. Can." i. 36.

† See the "Fragments" in C. Müller's "Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum," vol. i. pp. 36—43; and compare the fragments of Nicolaus Damascenus in the same work, vol. iii. pp. 380—386. This latter writer almost certainly followed Xanthus.

‡ Xanthus made a Lydian general found Ascalon (Fr. 23), which was a flourishing town in the time of Joshua (Judges i. 18)—about B.C. 1500.

§ "Iliad," ii. 864, 865. Herodotus tells us that the Lydians were originally called Mêones (i. 7).

It has commonly been allowed that Herodotus's third, or Mermnad, dynasty is historical.* Gyges, its first monarch, was contemporary with the Greek poet Archilochus, who mentioned him in his writings.† He sent magnificent offerings to Delphi, which were seen by Herodotus, and which the priests called "Gygian." ‡ Recently his name has been found in the inscriptions of the contemporary Assyrian monarch, Sardanapalus,§ who says that Gyges sent him presents, and accepted for a time the position of an Assyrian tributary. There is thus no shadow of doubt that a powerful and civilized monarchy was established on the west coast of Asia Minor at least as early as the beginning of the seventh century.

With regard to the second, or Heracleid, dynasty, there is more doubt. That a family distinct from that of the Mermnads ruled in Lydia before the accession of Gyges may be pronounced certain; and the continuous list of six kings, preserved by Nicolas of Damascus,‖ and taken by him most probably from Xanthus, seems to deserve acceptance as historical. But beyond this all is uncertain. We do not know what authority the Lydian informants of Herodotus had for their statement that the second

* Thirlwall, "History of Greece," vol. ii. p. 158; Grote, "History of Greece," vol. ii. p. 408.

† Herod. i. 12; Arist. "Rhet." iii. 17.

‡ Herod. i. 14.

§ See Mr. G. Smith's "History of Assur-bani-pal," pp. 64, 71, and 73.

‖ See the "Fragm. Hist. Gr.," vol. iii. pp. 380—386.

dynasty contained twenty-two kings in a direct line, whose reigns conjointly made up the number of 505 years. The statement itself is exceedingly improbable;* and it seems on the whole unlikely that the Lydians of the fifth century B.C. were in possession of authentic records and of an exact chronology reaching back between 700 and 800 years. Their estimate can scarcely have been anything better than a rough guess at the time that the (so-called) Heracleid dynasty had lasted. It may easily have been something worse. It may have been an attempt to support by an apparent synchronism the idea of a connection between the royal houses of Assyria and Lydia, dating from the thirteenth century B.C., which some of the Lydians seem clearly to have asserted.† But this supposed connection is probably a pure fiction,‡ the offspring of national vanity, without any foundation in fact. If the chronology was really invented to bolster up this figment, it does not deserve a moment's consideration, but may be consigned at once to oblivion.

As for the first Herodotean dynasty, its non-

* A continuous descent from father to son for twenty-two generations, without any failure of male offspring, or even any descent to a grandson, is very unlikely.

† The supposed genealogy of the first Heracleid king, who was said to have been "son of *Ninus* and grandson of *Belus*," proves this.

‡ There is no trace in the Assyrian inscriptions of any connection between Lydia and Assyria prior to the time of Gyges. Assyrian influence does not previously extend beyond Cilicia, Cappadocia, and perhaps South-eastern Phrygia.

historical character has been almost universally admitted.* The kings assigned to it are clearly mythical personages, belonging, not to the nation's history, but to its Pantheon. Manes is the *heros eponymus* of the Mêones, or Mæones; Atys and Cotys are gods; Lydus and Asies are again eponymous heroes; Meles is an ideal founder of the capital. History begins at the earliest with the Heracleids; but scarcely with Agron, who is not more real than Brute the Trojan, or than Hengist and Horsa, sons of Witgils, and great-grandsons of Odin. We cannot *trace* the Heracleids further back than about B.C. 850; the dynasty *may* have commenced some centuries earlier, but we really *know* nothing of Lydia before the ninth century.

From this time, however, if not even earlier, the Lydians appear to have been civilized. The wealth which Gyges boasted descended to him from the Heracleid kings, who doubtless washed the sands of Pactolus, and worked the mines of Tmolus for many generations. Commercial activity must have commenced and have made much progress under their sway, if, as seems tolerably certain, the invention of coined money was made by the Lydians during the time of their sovereignty.† This invention implies

* Heeren, "Manual of Ancient History," p. 478, E. T.; Grote, "Hist. of Greece," vol. ii. p. 408; Volney, "Recherches sur l'Histoire Ancienne," vol. i. p. 306; P. Smith, "Ancient History," vol. i. pp. 252, 253, etc.

† If the Lydians invented coined money, as asserted by

a high degree of mercantile intelligence, and can scarcely have been made until commercial transactions with foreign nations had become both numerous and intricate. Herodotus tells us that the Lydians, as far as he knew, were the first to engage in retail trade as a profession;* and among the nations of Western Asia they were noted for industry, for mental activity, and for a readiness to hold intercourse with foreign countries. They were skilled in music,† and originated a style of their own, which the Greeks regarded as soft and effeminate. They claimed to have invented a variety of games at a very remote period.‡ They were ship-builders, and did not shrink from the perils of long voyages.§ In glyptic art their early coins show them to have made some progress, for the animal forms upon these coins have considerable merit.‖ They were well acquainted with the art of squaring and polishing hard stone and marble. If the rock-sculptures existing in

Herodotus (i. 94), Xenophanes of Colophon (ap. Pol. ix. 83), and others, they must have done so before the time of Pheidon I., who introduced coined money into Argolis. But Pheidon I. flourished about B.C. 750, or half a century before Gyges.

* Herod. i. 94.

† On the Lydian music, see Mr. Grote's "History of Greece," vol. ii. p. 402–407; and compare Professor Donkin's article in Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," ad. voc. MUSICA.

‡ As dice, huckle-bones, and ball. (See Herod. i. 94.)

§ So Herodotus, l.s.c. Compare the statement of Diodorus (ap. Euseb. "Can. Chron.," i. 36), that they once held the command of the Mediterranean.

‖ See the author's "Herodotus," vol. i. p. 567.

their country* are to be ascribed to them, we must give them credit for some grandeur of conception, as well as for a power of executing such works under difficulties.

A grandeur of conception is also evidenced by the most remarkable of all the Lydian works which are still extant. The barrow, or tumulus, is a somewhat rude and common construction, requiring no great mechanical skill, and possessing little impressiveness, unless it is of vast size. The Lydians having adopted this simple form, which appears also in the neighbouring Troad,† for the tombs of their kings, gave dignity and majesty to their works by the scale on which they constructed them. The largest of them all, the famous "tomb of Alyattes," Herodotus compares with the monuments of Egypt and Babylon.‡ It was a conical mound, above a thousand feet in diameter, emplaced upon a basement of hewn stone, and crowned with five *stelæ*, or pillars, bearing inscriptions. It covered more space than the Great Pyramid, but can scarcely have had so great an elevation. In its centre it contained a sepulchral chamber, eleven feet long, eight broad, and seven high, formed of large blocks of white marble highly polished.§ It stood on the summit of a range of limestone hills which skirts the valley of the Hermus

* Texier, "Asie Mineure," vol. ii. p. 304; Hamilton, "Researches in Asia Minor," vol. i. p. 50.

† Schliemann's "Troy and its Remains," p. 178, and plate opposite.

‡ Herod. i. 93.

§ See the author's "Herodotus," vol. i. p. 184, note 6.

on the north, and is still "a conspicuous object on all sides."*

Herodotus speaks as if this tumulus had in his day stood alone. It is scarcely possible, however, that this was really so. The monument stands now in the midst of a necropolis of similar tombs, all of which are seemingly of at least equal antiquity. Modern travellers have counted more than sixty of these tumuli; and among them are three or four† but little inferior in size to the "tomb of Alyattes." These are, in all probability, the tombs of other (previous) Lydian kings, whose works Alyattes determined to outdo when he raised his great sepulchre. The size and number of the tumuli render this Lydian necropolis a most impressive sight. "It is impossible," says Mr. Hamilton,‡ a traveller rarely moved to admiration, "to look upon this collection of gigantic mounds, three of which are distinguished by their superior size, without being struck with the power and enterprise of the people by whom they were erected, and without admiring the energies of the nation who endeavoured to preserve the memories of their kings and ancestors by means of such rude and lasting monuments."

Lydian civilization belongs, then (so far as appears), to the three centuries commencing B.C. 850, and terminating B.C. 550. Like Phrygian civilization, it was (apparently) of home growth, only

* Hamilton, vol. i. p. 146.

† Chandler, "Tour in Asia Minor," p. 302.

‡ "Researches," vol. i. p. 146.

very slightly affected by the influence of Egypt, or of Assyria, or even of Phœnicia. The chief mark which is left behind was the invention of coined money, whereby it gave an impetus to trade and commerce that can scarcely be too highly appreciated. In other respects it was not a civilization of a high order. It did not affect literature, or science, or even art, otherwise than slightly. It probably, however, had some refining and softening influence on social intercourse and manners. Though the character of the Lydians for luxury and effeminacy belongs especially to later times,* to the period when they had become subjects of the Persian or Macedonian monarchy, yet we may trace, under the independent kingdom, the germs of this soft temper. Anacreon, who lived at the time of the Persian conquest, and can scarcely have lived long enough to note a change of character produced by subjection, pointedly remarked upon it.† It was alluded to by Sappho,‡ his earlier contemporary. Herodotus, in his story of Gyges, in his account of Lydian manners during the reign of Alyattes, and in his description of the court of Crœsus, implies it.§ Lydia must have played an important part in polishing and humanizing the

* See Grote, "Hist. of Greece," vol. ii. p. 405; and compare Herod. i. 155, 157; Æschyl. "Pers." 41 (*ἁβροδίαιτοι Λύδοι*); Athenæus, "Depin." xv. p. 690. C; Suidas ad voc. *καρύκη*.

† Anacreon (100) uses the word *λυδοπαθής*, "Lydian-tempered," for *ἡδυπαθής*, "soft-tempered."

‡ Sapph. Fr. 54, ed. Schneidewin.

§ Herod. i. 8—12, 29, and 93.

Greeks, to whom they were for a century and a half the main representatives of Asiatic civilization.

In the south-western corner of Asia Minor we have traces of a third civilization, which, though somewhat later than the two that we have been considering, is so united to them by locality, and so near to them in respect of time, as to render its conjunction with them in this review of early civilizations natural, if not necessary. Lycia extended along the southern coast of the peninsula from long. 28° 40′ to 30° 40′, comprising the fertile valleys of the Calbis and Xanthus, together with a large quantity of picturesque mountain country. It was inhabited by various warlike tribes, who maintained their independence* down to the time when Cyrus, having conquered Crœsus (B.C. 554), commanded his general, Harpagus, to complete the subjugation of Asia Minor. Harpagus reduced the Lycians after encountering a desperate resistance,† and apparently received as his reward the satrapy, or rather sub-satrapy,‡ of Lycia, which continued to be held by his descendants for eighty or a hundred years as a hereditary fief. During this period we find a style of architecture and of glyptic art existing in the country, which is very

* Herod. i. 28.

† Ibid. i. 176.

‡ Lycia, according to Herodotus (iii. 90), was included with Æolis, Ionia, Caria, and Pamphylia, in the first satrapy of Darius. Sub-satraps, however, were common in Persia (Xen. "Hell." iii. 1, § 10; Ælian. "Hist. Var." xii. 1, etc.).

surprising.* The Lycians either carve themselves sepulchral chambers out of the solid rock, or build themselves tombs of large masses of squared stone, in each case fashioning their sepulchres after the form of either a temple or a house, and adorning them with bas-reliefs, which approach nearly to the excellence of the best Greek art. These early Lycian sculptures furnish a most curious problem. They are so Greek in character as to suggest strongly the idea of Greek influence. But they are accompanied by Lycian inscriptions, and they belong apparently to a time when Persia, and not Greece, was mistress of the territory.† The question arises, Did art make the leap from the sculptures of Assyria to those of Lycia *in Asia*, without the help of the Greeks? and was Greece indebted to Lycia for the great bulk of those high qualities which are usually regarded as exclusively characterizing the artistic productions of Hella? If so, the Lycians deserve to stand on a pedestal among the Asiatic nations,‡ and to be regarded as con-

* For the Lycian art and architecture, see the admirable works of Sir C. Fellows, entitled "A Journal written during an Excursion in Asia Minor," and "An Account of Discoveries in Lycia." Compare also the Travels of Forbes and Spratt.

† See especially the matured views of Sir C. Fellows, as stated in his "Lycian Coins" (1855), pp. 18, 19.

‡ It has been suggested to me that the Cypriots, or Greeks of Cyprus, were perhaps a link between Assyria and Lycia; but as at present advised, I am inclined to think that the Cypriot remains, discovered by General Di Cesnola and others, are considerably later than the Lycian. (See Dr. Birch's remarks in the "Transactions" of the Biblical Archæological Soc. vol. iv. p. 20.)

stituting a most important link in the long series whereby the torch of knowledge has been handed on from age to age, and the gains made in early times by primitive Asiatic races have become the heritage of Europe and the common possession of modern civilized nations.

Nor are the Lycian sculptures important only as indicating the high artistic excellence to which the nation had attained. They showed in the details of dress and furniture an advanced state of upholstery and of textile industry,* which we should certainly not have expected to find among a people so little known and so seldom mentioned by ancient writers.† We must conclude from the reliefs assigned to the middle of the sixth century B.C. that the Lycians were already, at the time of the Persian conquest, on a par with any other Asiatic nation, in the comforts and luxuries of life, while they excelled all other Asiatics in artistic merit and genius.

It is in accordance with the general idea which we thus obtain of Lycian civilization, to find that the position of women in Lycia was much higher than that usually assigned to the weaker sex by the Orientals. Citizenship and nobility were transmitted in Lycia by the female line; and men, in tracing their genealogies, gave the list of their female, and not of

* See especially the chairs, footstools, and dresses on the "Harpy Tomb," now in the British Museum.

† We mean "ancient" in a strict sense. From the time of their connection with Rome (B.C. 188) the Lycians are frequently mentioned; but they had then lost their Asiatic character, and become thoroughly Hellenised.

their male ancestors.* Moreover, the Lycian sculptors freely exhibited the forms of women in their bas-reliefs, representing them as unveiled before men, and as present with them at banquets.† Herodotus, in close agreement with the monuments, notes this fact of the Caunians,‡ who are proved by the inscriptions of their country to have been a mere branch of the Lycian people.§

The three civilizations of which we have hitherto treated in this chapter belong most probably to the space between B.C. 850 and B.C. 450. If they ascend any higher, it is impossible, for want of records, to trace them. We may, however, gather from Homer, and from certain modern researches, that in the north-western corner of the Peninsula a civilization of a somewhat low type was established on the banks of the Scamander some four or five centuries earlier. Whether Dr. Schliemann's discoveries are to be regarded as having brought to light the veritable city whereof Homer sang or no, at any rate they prove the existence of metallurgic and ceramic skill, and of a certain amount of ingenuity and taste in ornament at a very remote date, prior to the introduction of letters,‖ and while flint and stone

* Herod. i. 173.

† See especially the bas-reliefs on the tomb of Zala, in the British Museum, which, though latish, have still a strong Lycian character about them.

‡ Herod. i. 172.

§ Fellows, "Lycian Coins," p. 5.

‖ We are wholly sceptical as to Dr. Schliemann's "eighteen inscriptions" (Troy and its Remains," p. 373). They have been

instruments were still employed to a large extent,* in the district where Troy must have stood—the broad plain bounded by hills, which is watered by the two streams of the Scamander and the Simoïs. If not the actual relics of the city of Priam, they indicate probably what the relics of that city would be if we were to find them, and what the character of its civilization was. We cannot agree with Dr. Schliemann that his discoveries reveal "a *great* civilization and a *great* taste for art." What we find is a knowledge of metallurgy sufficient to produce cups, vases, ornaments, and implements, some of which are cast, some wrought by the hammer, some brought into their actual shape by a fusing together of their pieces; an acquaintance with the method of hardening copper by uniting it with an alloy of tin;† a power of producing terra cotta jars of a good quality, and as much as two feet in height; a tolerable taste in personal ornament, especially shown in female head-dresses, in bracelets, and in earrings;‡ a fair skill in masonry; and a very

interpreted as Chinese (ibid. p. 51,) as written in the Cyprian character from left to right (ibid. p. 366), and as written in the same character from right to left (ibid. p. 368). It is finally confessed (p. 369) that they are not interpreted or deciphered at all. To us they appear a mere rude patterning, in no essential respect different from the markings allowed to be patterns.

* "Troy and its Remains," pp. 21, 22, 94, 112, etc.

† Ibid. p. 361. The alloy is less than was ultimately found to be best. The tin should stand to the copper as one to ten. In the "Trojan" specimens analyzed it is at most as one to eleven; at least, as one to twenty-five.

‡ "Troy and its Remains," pp. 335–340.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE CIVILIZATIONS OF CENTRAL ASIA—ASSYRIA, MEDIA AND PERSIA, INDIA.

Civilization in Central Asia—Supposed antiquity of the Assyrian Empire—View of Ctesias—More moderate chronology of Berosus and Herodotus—Cuneiform monuments fix about B.C. 1500 for commencement of Assyrian independence—Flourishing period begins B.C. 1300—General character of Assyrian civilization—Architecture—Sculpture—Minor ornamental arts—First beginnings of Iranian civilization—Supposed date of Zoroaster—Earliest portions of Zendavesta not before B.C. 1500—Character of the early civilization—Fresh impulse received about B.C. 850—Greatest development between B.C. 630 and B.C. 450—Leading features of the architecture and sculpture—Decoration of palaces—Literary cultivation—Habits of life—Indic civilization nearly coeval with Iranic—Four periods of Sanskrit literature—Chronology of the periods—Civilization begins about B.C. 1200—Character of the civilization as indicated by the Vedic writings.

WHILE the Aryan civilizations, described in the last chapter, were developing themselves peacefully side by side, in the extreme west of the Asiatic continent, the region which juts out towards Europe, and is known by the name of Asia Minor, the more central portion of the Continent—the Mesopotamian Plain, the great Iranic Plateau, and the Peninsula of Hindustan—was the scene of a struggle, not always peaceful, between

three other types of human progress and advancement, which in those parts contended for the mastery. Two of these were, like the West-Asian civilizations, Aryan, while one, the Assyrian, was of an entirely different character. It is this last to which we propose to give the foremost place in the present chapter, not that we should assign it a priority of beginning over the other two, but inasmuch as it reached earliest its full development, and so belongs on the whole, to a more remote period in the world's history.

The Assyrian empire is regarded by some writers as having commenced above 2000 years B.C.* Ctesias declared† that a thousand years before the Trojan War a great chief, Ninus, had founded Nineveh, had established his dominion from the shores of the Ægean to the sources of the Upper Oxus, and had left his throne to his descendants, who held it through thirty generations for above thirteen centuries. The date of Ctesias for the Trojan War‡ was probably about B.C. 1200—1190; so that he must have meant to place the commencement of the Assyrian power about B.C. 2200. This view was long followed by writers on ancient history,§ by whom the authority of Ctesias,

* Clinton, "Fasti Hellenici," vol. i. p. 263, sqq.; Rollin's "Histoire Ancienne," vol. ii. pp. 12–14.

† Ap. Diod. Sic. ii. 21, 22.

‡ See Clinton, l. s. c.

§ As by Cephalion, Castor, Nicolas of Damascus, Trogus Pompeius, Velleius Paterculus, Josephus, Eusebius, Moses of Chorene, Syncellus, Dean Prideaux, Freret, Rollin, and others.

who passed seventeen years at the Court of Susa, and had access to the Persian archives, was regarded as paramount. There have been, however, at all times historians to whom the Assyrian chronology of Ctesias has seemed extravagant and unreal, who have thought little of his authority,* and have lowered his date for the establishment of the Assyrian empire by nine hundred or a thousand years. Statements in Herodotus and in Berosus could be adduced in favour of the more moderate computation ;† and it accorded better than that of Ctesias with the scattered notices contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. Thus, the shorter chronology has at all times held its ground against the longer one ; and having approved itself to such writers as Volney, Heeren, B. G. Niebuhr, and Brandis, has in the present century been the view most generally accepted by historical critics.

The question, however, might have remained an open one for all time, either side of it being arguable, and the balance of probability appearing

* Among the ancients, Aristotle, Plutarch, and Arrian ; among the moderns, Scaliger, Niebuhr, and Mure, have detected and denounced the ill-faith and charlatanry of Ctesias, who seems to have had an actual love of lying.

† Herodotus (i. 95) placed the foundation of the Assyrian empire 520 years before the revolt of the Medes, which event he placed in the latter half of the eighth century B.C. Berosus (Fr. 11) made the Assyrians acquire preponderance over Babylon 526 years before the accession of Pul, who was contemporary with Menahem (2 Kings xv. 19), and must therefore have reigned towards the middle of that century. Both notices point to a commencement of the empire in the course of the 13th century B.C.

to different minds to incline differently, had not the discovery and decipherment of the cuneiform records come in to determine it. By their aid the connected histories of Assyria and Babylonia can now be traced back continuously, and with a chronology that, if not exact, is at least approximate, to the middle of the fifteenth century B.C.* It is now made clear † that, so far from there having been at this date a vast Assyrian empire, which for seven hundred and fifty years had ruled over all Asia, from the Mediterranean and Ægean to the banks of the Oxus and the Indus, Assyria was really, in B.C. 1500—1400, a weak state, confined within narrow boundaries, and only just emerging from Babylonian tutelage, its earlier rulers having been called *patesi*, or "viceroys," and its monarchs at this period having only just begun to assume the grander and more dignified title of "kings of countries." ‡ The Assyrian *empire* does not commence till a century and a half later, B.C. 1300, when Tiglathi-Nin (perhaps the Ninus of the Greeks) took Babylon,§ and established the predominance of Assyria over Lower as well as Upper Mesopotamia. We cannot date much earlier than this the commencement of

* See the author's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. ii. pp. 49–56, 2d edit.

† M. Lenormant says emphatically, and with good reason, "En effet des monuments positifs ne nous permettent plus aujourd'hui de douter que la monarchie Assyrienne n'ait débuté dans le quinzième siécle avant notre ére." ("Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne," vol. ii. p. 56.)

‡ See the Records of the Past," vol. v. p. 81.

§ Ibid. p. 85.

that peculiar form of Semitic civilization which is associated with the idea of Assyria, partly from the accounts of ancient writers,* but mainly from the recovered treasures of art and literature which line the walls and load the shelves of our museums.

The civilization of the Assyrians was material rather than spiritual. Its main triumphs were in architecture, in glyptic and plastic art, in metallurgy, gem-cutting, and manufactures, not in philosophy, or literature, or science,† properly so called. According to some, its architecture went to the extent of producing edifices of a magnificence scarcely exceeded by the grandest buildings of any age or country—edifices four or five stories in height, of varied outline, richly adorned from base to summit, and commandingly placed on lofty platforms of a solid and massive character. The restorations of Mr. Fergusson, adopted by Mr. Layard,‡ present to the eye Assyrian façades whose grandeur is undeniable, while, if the style and luxuriance of their ornamentation are somewhat

* See especially Diod. Sic. ii. Compare Ezek. xxiii. 14–16.

† In engineering science, which is a *practical* matter, the Assyrians made considerable progress. They were well acquainted with the principle of the arch, and could span with it a space of fourteen or fifteen feet; they constructed tunnels through the solid rock, sluices, dams, and drains. They knew the use of the pulley, the lever, and the roller. They quarried and moved, with a full sense of security, masses of stone with which modern builders would scarcely venture to meddle. (See Layard, "Nineveh and Babylon," pp. 105–112.)

‡ See the coloured print, which stands first in Mr. Layard's "Monuments of Nineveh," second series, and the frontispiece to his "Nineveh and Babylon."

barbaric, yet the entire effect is beyond question splendid, striking, admirable. If these representations are truthful, if they really reproduce the ancient edifices, or even convey a correct impression of their general character, we must pronounce the Assyrian architecture to have attained results which the best architects of the present day could not easily outdo. Even if we hesitate to accept as ascertained fact conclusions which are in reality the ingenious conjectures of a fertile imagination, we must still allow that the actual remains sufficiently indicate a grandeur of conception and plan,* an appreciation of the fine effect of massiveness, and a variety and richness in ornament, which go far to show that the Assyrians were really great as builders, though it may be impossible, with such data as we possess, to restore or reconstruct their edifices.

If the remains of Assyrian architecture are such as to preclude an *exact* estimate of the merit to which the Assyrians are entitled as builders, with respect to their glyptic art it is quite otherwise. Here the remains are ample, and, indeed, superabundant. The museums of London, Paris, and

* Mr. Fergusson says with truth, "The imperial palace of Sennacherib is, of all the buildings of antiquity, surpassed in magnitude only by the great palace-temple of Karnak; and when we consider the vastness of the mound on which it was raised, and the richness of the ornaments with which it was adorned, it is by no means clear that it was not as great, or at least as expensive, a work as the great palace-temple at Thebes." (See his "Handbook of Architecture," vol. i. p. 176).

Berlin contain the spoils of the great Mesopotamian cities in such profusion that no one acquainted with them can lack the means of forming a decided opinion upon the artistic power of the people. Even such as are without the leisure or the opportunity of visiting these rich depositories and seeing the sculptures for themselves, may form a very tolerable judgment of them from the excellent works which have been published on the subject, as especially those of Mr. Layard and M. Botta.* The author of the present work has also done his best to assist the public in forming correct views by placing before them the main features of Assyrian art in a condensed form in his "Monarchy of Assyria."† Mr. Vaux, in his "Nineveh and Persepolis," and various writers in the "Dictionary of the Bible" and the "Bible Educator," have worked in the same direction; and the result is a very wide acquaintance with the products of Assyrian artists, if not a very exact critical appreciation of their merits.‡

* The two folios of Mr. Layard, entitled "Monuments of Nineveh, First Series," and "Monuments of Nineveh, Second Series," are works of great merit, highly creditable to English private enterprise. The "Monument de Ninive" of M. Botta has all the magnificence and *luxe* which naturally results from the French system of state subventions.

† Forming part of his "Ancient Oriental Monarchies" (London, Murray, 1871, second edition).

‡ It is to be hoped that Englishmen generally form their estimate rather from the sculptures themselves in the British Museum, than from that coarse travesty of them which is to be seen in the "Assyrian Court" of a certain suburban building. (See "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. p. 362).

It may perhaps be allowed to the present writer to insert here, instead of a new criticism, the estimate which he formed of Assyrian glyptic art fifteen years ago, when fresh from a five years' study of the subject. "In the Assyrian sculpture it is the actual," he said,* "the historically true, which the artist strives to represent. Unless in the case of a few mythic figures connected with the religion of the country, there is nothing in the Assyrian bas-reliefs which is not imitated from nature. The imitation is always laborious, and often most accurate and exact. The laws of representation, as we understand them, are sometimes departed from; but it is always to impress the spectator with ideas in accordance with truth. Thus the colossal bulls and lions have five legs, but in order that they may be seen from every point of view with four; the ladders are placed *edgeways* against the walls of besieged towns, but it is to show that they are ladders, and not mere poles; walls of cities are made disproportionately small, but it is done, like Raphael's boat, to bring them within the picture, which would otherwise be a less complete representation of the actual fact. The careful finish, the minute detail, the elaboration of every hair in a beard, and every stitch in the embroidery of a dress, reminds us of the Dutch school of painting, and illustrates strongly the spirit of faithfulness and honesty which pervades the sculptures and gives them so great a portion of their value. In conception, in grace, in freedom and

* "Herodotus," vol. i. pp. 496, 497, first edition.

correctness of outline, they fall undoubtedly far behind the inimitable productions of the Greeks; but they have a grandeur, a dignity, a boldness, a strength and an appearance of life which render them even intrinsically valuable as works of art; and, considering the time at which they were produced, must excite our surprise and admiration. Art, so far as we know, had existed previously only in the stiff and lifeless conventionalism of the Egyptians. It belonged to Assyria to confine the conventional to religion, and to apply art to the vivid representations of the highest scenes of human life. War in all its forms—the march, the battle, the pursuit, the siege of towns, the passage of rivers and marshes, the submission and treatment of captives—and the "mimic war" of hunting, the chase of the lion, the stag, the antelope, the wild bull, and the wild ass—are the chief subjects treated by the Assyrian sculptors; and in these the conventional is discarded; fresh scenes, new groupings, bold and strange attitudes perpetually appear; and in the animal representations especially there is a continual advance, the latest being the most spirited, the most varied, and the most true to nature,* though

* The hunting scenes from the palace of Ashur-bani-pal (Sardanapalus of the Greeks) are the most perfect specimens of Assyrian glyptic art. They are to be seen in the *basement* room devoted to Assyrian art in the British Museum. Sir E. Landseer was wont to admire the truthfulness and spirit of these reliefs, more especially of one where hounds are pulling down a wild ass. ("Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. p. 517.) Professor Rolleston has expressed to me his admiration of a wounded lioness, in the same

perhaps lacking somewhat of the majesty and grandeur of the earlier.* With no attempt to idealize or go beyond nature, there is a growing power of depicting things as they are—an increased grace and delicacy of execution, showing that Assyrian art was progressive, not stationary, and giving a promise of still higher excellence, had circumstances permitted its development."

To their merit as sculptors and architects, the Assyrians added an excellent taste in the modelling of vases, jars, and drinking-cups, a clever and refined metallurgy, involving methods which, till revealed by their remains, were unknown to the moderns,† a delicacy in the carving of ivory and mother-of-pearl, a skill in gem-engraving, glass-blowing and colouring, brick-enamelling, furniture-making, and robe-embroidering,‡ which place them beyond question among the most advanced and elegant of Oriental peoples, and show that, from a material point of view, their civilization did not fall very greatly behind that of the Greeks. Combined with this progress in luxury and refinement, and this high perfection of the principal arts that embellish and beautify life, their sculptures and

series, where the paralysis of the lower limbs, consequent upon an arrow piercing the spine, is finely rendered. (Ibid. p. 512.)

* See Layard, "Monuments of Nineveh," First Series, p. 3; and compare "Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. p. 345.

† Layard, "Nineveh and Babylon," p. 191, note.

‡ For details the writer must once more refer to his "Assyrian Monarch," where the entire subject of Assyrian art and manufacture is carefully worked out. (See ch. vi.)

their records reveal much which revolts and disgusts —savage punishments, brutalizing war customs, a debasing religion, a cruel treatment of prisoners, a contempt for women, a puerile and degrading superstitiousness*—teaching the lesson, which the present age would do well to lay seriously to heart, that material progress, skill in manufactures and in arts, even refined taste and real artistic excellence, are no sure indications of that civilization which is alone of real value, the civilization of the heart, a condition involving not merely polished manners, but gentleness, tenderness, self-restraint, purity, elevation of mind and soul, devotion of the thoughts and life to better things than comfort or luxury, or the cultivation of the æsthetic faculties.

Iranic civilization, or that of the Medes, the Persians, and (perhaps we should add) the Bactrians, is supposed by some moderns† to have origniated as early as B.C. 3784. Others‡ assign to it the comparatively moderate date of B.C. 2600—2500. The writer, however, who is most conversant with the early Iranic writings, and most competent to judge of their real age, Dr. Martin Haug, does not think it necessary to postulate for his favourites, the Iranians, nearly so great an antiquity. Haug suggests§ the fifteenth century B.C. as that of the most

* For proofs of this, see "Records of the Past," vol. i. pp. 133—135, and vol. v. pp. 169—176.

† See Baron Bunsen, "Egypt," vol. v. p. 77.

‡ Lenormant, "Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol. ii. p. 307.

§ Haug, "Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees," p. 225.

primitive Iranic compositions, which form the chief, if not the sole, evidence of an Iranic cultivation prior to B.C. 700.

The question is one rather of linguistic criticism than of historic testimony. The historic statements that have come down to us on the subject of the age of Zoroaster, with whose name the origin of Iranic cultivation is by general consent regarded as intimately connected, are so absolutely conflicting that they must be pronounced valueless. Eudoxus and Aristotle* said that Zoroaster lived 6,000 years before the death of Plato, or B.C. 6348. Hermippus† placed him 5,000 years before the Trojan War, or B.C. 6184. Berosus declared of him that he reigned at Babylon towards the beginning of the twenty-third century before our era,‡ having ascended the throne, according to his chronological views, about B.C. 2286. Xanthus Lydus,§ the contemporary of Herodotus, and the *first* Greek writer who treats of the subject, made him live six hundred years only before the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, or B.C. 1080. The later Greeks and Romans declared that he was contemporary with Darius Hystaspis,‖ thus making his date about B.C. 520—485. Between the earliest and the latest of the dates assigned by

* Ap. Plin. "Hist. Nat.," xxx. 2.

† Ibid.

‡ Berosus, Fr. 11, compared with Syncellus, "Chronographia," p, 147.

§ Xanth. Lyd., Fr. 29.

‖ Agathias, p. 117 c.; Arnob. i. 52; Clem. Alex. "Stromata," i. p. 357; Apuleius, "Florid." ii. p. 231.

these authorities, the difference (it will be seen) is one of nearly *six thousand years!*

Modern criticism doubts whether Zoroaster ever lived at all, and regards his name as designating a period rather than a person.* The period intended is that of the composition of the earliest portions of the Zendavesta. To these portions, which are poems, and in the original bear the name of Gâthas, Haug (as we have already stated) assigns as the most probable date about B.C. 1500. We see no reason for doubting the soundness of this expert's judgment, and we incline, therefore, to regard Iranic civilization as having commenced somewhat earlier than Assyrian.

Of this primitive civilization, whereof the seat seems to have been Bactria, rather than Media or Persia, we possess no actual remains, no tangible or material evidences. The only existing proofs of it are the Zendic writings; and the only notion of it which we can gain is that derivable from a careful study of these writings, or rather of their most ancient portions. From these we gather that the primitive Iranians were a settled people, possessing cities of some size, that they were devoted to agriculture, and fairly advanced in the arts most necessary

* Bunsen waives "the personality of the prophet" when he is discussing the date of Zoroastrianism ("Egypt's Place," vol. iii. p. 471). Lenormant inclines to regard Zoroaster as a person, but confesses that his existence is "enveloped in an obscurity which will probably remain for ever impenetrable" ("Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne," vol. ii. p. 308). Niebuhr consigns him altogether to the region of myth ("Kl. Schriften," vol. i. p. 260).

for human life. They had domesticated certain animals, as the horse, the cow, and the dog. They knew how to extract an exhilarating liquor from the Soma or Homa plant, the acid Asclepias or *Sarcostema viminalis*. They lived peaceably together, and recognized the supremacy of law. They had formed the conception of poetry, and, while some could frame, the generality could appreciate the beauty of metrical compositions. Above all, they had a religion, which was surprisingly pure and elevated,* consisting mainly in the worship of a single supreme God, an all-wise, all-bounteous Spirit, Ahuramazda.

The cultivation thus begun about B.C. 1500 in the far-off and little-known Bactria, received a fresh impulse towards the middle of the ninth century B.C., when the Iranians first came into contact with the Assyrians. † Migratory movements had by this time brought the Medes into the district which thenceforth bore their name, and having thus become neighbours of the Assyrians, whose civilization was already advanced, they could not but gain something from their novel experience. Among

* Lenormant says, with truth, "La doctrine de Zoroastre est sans contredit le plus puissant effort de l'esprit humain vers le spiritualisme et la vérité métaphysique, sur lequel on ait essayé de fonder une religion en dehors de la révélation et par les seules forces de la raison naturelle: elle est la doctrine la plus pure, la plus noble, et la plus vois de la vérité parmi celles de l'Asie et de tout le monde antique, à part celle des Hébreux, basée sur la parole divine." ("Manuel," vol. ii. pp. 308, 309).

† The contact appears in the cuneiform remains of this century. ("Ancient Monarchies," vol. ii. pp. 101–116).

the chief gains made was probably that of writing. The wedge was adopted as the element out of which letters should be composed, and an alphabet was formed far less cumbrous than the Assyrian syllabarium, whereby it became easy to express articulate sounds by written symbols, and so to give permanency to the transient and fleeting phenomena of ordinary spoken language.

Further advances were made between the end of the seventh and the middle of the fifth century B.C. about which time Iranian cultivation reached its greatest development. The Medes first (B.C. 630), and the Persians afterwards (B.C. 560), attained to the leading position among the Oriental nations, and, inheriting the power, entered also into possession of the accumulated knowledge and civilization of the earlier masters of Asia. They did not, however, simply continue the past, or reproduce what they found existing. In the remains of Median and Persian times found at Hamadan (Ecbatana), Behistun, Istakr (Persepolis), Nakhsh-i-Rustam, and Murghab (Pasargadæ), we have evidences of Iranian art and architecture, which are most remarkable, and which give the Medo-Persic people a very important position in the history of æsthetic culture. While adopting one or two leading features of building and ornamentation from their Semitic predecessors, the Iranic races in the main gave a vent to their own native genius and fancy, and the consequence was that they introduced into the world

a wholly new architecture,* a style of high relief not previously attempted, and a method of decoration altogether their own, excellently well adapted to the character of their climate and country.†

The Iranic architecture was characterized, in the first place, by simplicity and regularity of design, and in the second by the profuse employment of the column. The buildings have for the most part a symmetry and exactness resembling that of Greek temples.‡ They were emplaced on terraces formed of vast blocks of hewn stone,§ and were approached by staircases of striking and unusual design. Double porticoes of eight, twelve, or sixteen columns gave entrance into pillared halls, where the columns were sixteen, thirty-six, or (in one instance) as many as one hundred in number. Originally the pillars may have been mere wooden posts,‖ such as are commonly used in the domestic architecture of most nations where wood is plentiful. These, when wealth flowed in, it became the practice to overspread with thin sheets of the precious metals.¶ But after a

* Mr. Fergusson disputes this. He is of opinion that the Persian architecture was, in the main, a mere copy of the Assyrian, differing only in the substitution of stone pillars for wooden posts; but the use of wooden posts by the Assyrians is "not proven."

† See Loftus, "Chaldæa and Susiana," p. 375.

‡ See the representation, "Ancient Monarchies," vol. iii. p. 289; and compare Rich's "Persepolis," p. 244.

§ Some of these at Persepolis are as much as *fifty* feet long, and from seven to ten feet broad. (See Flandin "Voyage en Perse," vol. i. page 77.)

‖ This seems to have been the case at Ecbatana ("Ancient Monarchies," vol. ii. page 265).

¶ Polyb. x. 27, § 10.

while the Iranic architects, having to erect palaces in districts where wood was scarce, conceived the idea of substituting shafts of stone for the original wooden posts, and carried out their notion so successfully that at last they were able to poise in air pillars sixty-four feet high, having beautifully slender shafts, rich bases, and capitals of an elegant, but perhaps somewhat too elaborate, composition. The halls constructed on these supports extended over so vast an area that moderns have found no existing constructions with which they could compare them but the most ambitious of European cathedrals. Speaking of the Chehl Minar, or Great Hall of Xerxes, at Persepolis, Mr. Fergusson says: "We have no cathedral in England that at all comes near it in dimensions; nor, indeed, in France or Germany is there one that covers so much ground. Cologne comes nearest to it; . . . but in linear horizontal dimensions the *only* edifice of the middle ages that comes up to it is Milan Cathedral, which covers 107,800 feet, and (taken all in all) is perhaps the building that resembles it most, both in style and the general character of the effect it must have produced on the spectator."

For the ornamentation of their buildings, externally, and to some extent internally, the Iranians, imitating their Semitic predecessors, employed sculpture. They did not, however, follow slavishly the pattern set them, but in important respects improved upon their models. They adopted generally a style

* Fergusson, "Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis," pp. 171, 172.

of much higher relief than that which had prevailed in Assyrian times, sometimes almost disengaging their figures from the background,* sometimes carving them both in front and at the side, so that they did not fall far short of being statues.† They gave to their human heads great dignity,‡ and imparted to some animal forms§ a life and vigour never greatly surpassed. In variety and grace, however, they cannot be said to have equalled the Assyrians; and it is in their architecture, rather than in their glyptic art, that they give evidence of real originality and genius.

Their internal decoration of palaces was especially admirable. "Such edifices as the Chehl Minar at Persepolis, and its duplicate at Susa—where long vistas of columns met the eye on every side, and the great central cluster was supported by lighter detached groups, combining similarity of form with some variety of ornament; where richly-coloured drapings contrasted with the cool grey stone of the building, and a golden roof overhung a pavement of many hues;"‖ where a throne of gold under a canopy of purple stood on an elevated platform at

* See the representation, "Ancient Monarchies," vol. iii. p. 334, which is taken from a photograph.

† Ibid. page 296.

‡ The casts in the British Museum, taken from the Persepolitan sculptures, show this sufficiently. The sculptures themselves are still in *sitû* for the most part.

§ As especially those of bulls and lions. (See "Ancient Monarchies," vol. iii. p. 339, and compare Flandin, "Voyage en Perse," vol. i. p. 126.)

‖ See "Ancient Monarchies," vol. iii. p. 328.

one end,* backed by "hangings of white and green and blue, fastened with cords of white and purple to silver rings," attached to the "pillars of marble;"† where carpets of dazzling brightness lay here and there upon the patterned floor, and through the interstices of the hangings were seen the bright blue sky and the verdant prairies and distant mountains of Khuzistan or Farsistan—must have been among the fairest creations with which human art ever embellished the earth, and beyond a doubt compared favourably with any edifices which, up to the time of their construction, had been erected in any country or by any people. It was in these glorious buildings that Iranian architecture culminated; and there is reason to believe that from them the Grecian architects gained those ideas, which, fructifying in their artistic minds, led on to the best triumphs of Hellenic constructive art, the magnificent temples of Diana (Artemis) at Ephesus,‡ and of Minerva (Athené) on the Acropolis of Athens.

Of Iranian literary cultivation, not much is known. There are no portions of the Zendavesta which can be positively assigned to the space between B.C. 900 and B.C. 330. The inscriptions of this period§ are dry documents, and as compositions have little merit;

* See "Ancient Monarchies," vol. iii. p. 291.

† Esther i. 6.

‡ See the "Ephesos" of Professor Curtius, recently published.

§ These will be found in Sir H. Rawlinson's "Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions," published in the "Journal" of the Royal Asiatic Society, vols. x., xi., xii., and in the "Altpersische Keilinschriften" of Spiegel (pp. 5–45).

but lapidary literature is rarely of an attractive kind. We are told that the Persians of the Achæmenian times (B.C. 560—330) had among them historians and poets;* but the productions of these early authors have perished, and we have no account of them that is to be depended on. Perhaps it is, on the whole, most probable that in the great work of Firdausi † we have, in the main, a reproduction of the legends with which the antique poets occupied themselves, and so may gather from his pages a general idea of the style and spirit of the early Persian poetry.

In manners and general habits of life the Iranians did not differ greatly from the Assyrians. Their original religion was indeed of a high type, but it became corrupted as time went on,‡ and ultimately sank into a mere debasing and sensualistic nature-worship.§ Their war customs were less brutal than those of their predecessors, but their system of punishment was almost equally savage;‖ they had the same low estimate of women; they were cruel and treacherous, voluptuous, luxurious, given to drunkenness.¶ Western Asia was perhaps better governed under their sway than it had ever been previously;

* Herod. i. 1; Ctes. ap. Diod. Sic. ii. 32, § 4; Strab. xv. 3, § 18; Dina ap. Athen. Deipn. xiv. p. 633, D.

† The "Shahnameh," or "Book of the Kings," a good idea of which may be gathered from the account and translations of Mr. Atkinson.

‡ The corruption had begun as early as the time of Herodotus (Herod. i. 131).

§ See "Ancient Monarchies," vol. iii. pp. 360, 361.

‖ Ibid. pp. 246, 247.

¶ Herod. i. 133; Strab. xv. 3, § 20: Duris Sam. Fr. 13.

but there was still much in their governmental system that was imperfect, and that fell short even of what is possible under a despotism. Their civilization may be pronounced to have been, on the whole, more advanced than that of the Assyrians; it had a moral aspect; it was less merely material; but the highest qualities of real civilization were absent from it, and it cannot be said to have laid the world at large under many obligations.

Indic civilization is supposed to have commenced about the same time with Iranic. There are so many points of resemblance between the ancient hymns of the Rig-Veda and the Gâthas, allowed to form the most ancient portions of the Avesta, that it is almost impossible for persons familiar with both to assign them to periods very far apart. The ancestors of the Medes and Persians on the one hand, and of the Hindoos upon the other, appear to have left their primitive abode about the same time, and to have embodied their earliest religious thoughts soon after they separated in poems of the same character. Thus, there is a general agreement among literary critics as to the near connection in date of the two literatures. With regard, however, to the actual period, great diversity of opinion prevails, the same variety of views * obtaining in respect of the earliest

* Bunsen, whose date for Zoroaster is B.C. 3784, assigns the "oldest Vedic songs" to the period between B.C. 4000 and B.C. 3120 ("Egypt's Place," vol. iii. p. 573, compared with p. 564). Lenormant, who places Zoroaster between B.C. 2600 and B.C. 2500, believes the earliest portions of the Vedas to have been written

Vedas as we have already shown to exist with respect to the Gâthas of the Zendavesta. But here again the chief "expert"—the writer who has the largest acquaintance with the whole range of the Indian compositions, and with the general history of language—has expressed himself, in moderate terms, as favourable to a date which is, comparatively speaking, late. Professor Max Müller, in his "Ancient Sanskrit Literature," lays it down that there are four periods of Vedic composition—the Chandas period, Mantra period, Brahmana period, and Sutra period; and after an elaborate and exhaustive discussion, of which it is impossible not to admire the candour and the learning, comes to the conclusion that the approximate date of each may be laid down as follows:—*

Chandas period . .	1200 to 1000 B.C.
Mantra period . .	1000 to 800 B.C.
Brahmana period . .	800 to 600 B.C.
Sutra period . . .	600 to 200 B.C.

Thus according to the highest living authority, the commencement of Vedic literature, and so of Indian civilization, need not be placed farther back than the beginning of the twelfth century B.C.

The civilization which the writings of the Chandas period reveal is one of great simplicity.† Cities

between B.C. 3000 and B.C. 2600 ("Manuel d' Histoire Ancienne," vol. ii. pp. 313, 445, 497, and 572.)

* See pp. 301 and 305.

† "Ancient Sanskrit Literature," pp. 525–572. Compare Lenormant's "Manuel," vol. ii. p. 305; vol. iii. pp. 445–471.

seem not to be mentioned; there is no organized political life; no war worthy of the name; nothing but plundering expeditions. Tribes exist under their heads, who are at once kings, priests, judges, and poets, and to whom the rest render obedience. Religion is a worship by hymns, and with simple offerings, as of honey, but scarcely yet with regular sacrifice. There is a power of metaphysical speculation which may perhaps surprise us, but which seems congenital to the Oriental mind; and there is evidence of progress in some of the mechanical arts beyond what might have been expected. Ships are familiar objects to the writers of the poems; chariots are in common use; the horse and cow are domesticated, and are sheltered in stables; armour is worn, and is sometimes of gold; shields are carried in battle; an intoxicating drink is brewed; dice have been invented, and gambling is not uncommon.

As time goes on, this extreme simplicity disappears.* There are advances of various kinds. Cities are built and magnificent palaces constructed; trades become numerous; luxury creeps in. The priests, having come to be a separate class, introduce an elaborate ceremonial. Music is cultivated; writing is invented or learnt. But, after all, the material progress made is not very great. Indian civilization is, in the main, intellectual, not material. Careless of life and action, of history, politics, artistic excellence, trade, commerce, manufacture, the Indians concentrate their attention on the highest branches of

* "Ancient Sanskrit Literature," pp. 71–524.

metaphysics, ponder on themselves and their future, on the nature of the Divine essence, on their own relation to it, and the prospects involved in that relationship.* They discuss and they solve the most difficult questions of metaphysical science; they elaborate grammar, the science of language, which is the reflected image of thought; they altogether occupy themselves with the inward, not with the outward—with the eternal world of mind and rest, not with the transitory and illusory world of outward seeming and incessant changefulness. Hence the triumphs of their civilization are abstract and difficult to appreciate. They lie outside the ordinary interests of mankind, and are, moreover, shrouded in a language known to few, and from which there are but few translations. It is said, however, by those whose acquaintance with the early Indian literature is the widest, that there is scarcely a problem in the sciences of ontology, psychology, metaphysics, logic, or grammar, which the Indian sages have not sounded as deeply, and discussed as elaborately, as the Greeks.†

* Strabo, xv., 59 and 65; Max Müller, pp. 18-32.

† Lenormant, "Manuel," vol. iii. pp. 625–639.

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE CIVILIZATION OF THE ETRUSCANS.

Etruria the source of Early Roman civilization—Supposed date of the commencement of Etruscan power, B.C. 1000 or even B.C. 1400—Real date probably not before B.C. 650—Most flourishing period from B.C. 620 to B.C. 500—Character of Etruscan civilization—Architecture—Its massiveness—Walls—Towers—Gateways—Sewers—Vaults—Tombs—Æsthetic art—Statues—Bas-reliefs—Paintings—Bronzes generally—Candelabra—Engraved mirrors—Vases—Figures in clay—Etruscan music—General mode of life—Higher elements of civilization wanting—Characteristics of the government—Low morality—Small progress in science and literature.

AMONG early civilizations, one of the most remarkable is that of the Etruscans. At a time when the Romans and the Latins generally were in a condition but little advanced beyond that of savages, when Rome itself was a collection of mud huts, surrounded by a palisade, the Etruscan nation—spread over the greater part of Northern Italy—was in possession of fine cities, handsome buildings, richly-ornamented tombs, elegant dresses, music, painting, sculpture, and most of the useful arts, and even many of the refinements of life. "Rome," it has been well said,* "before her intercourse with Greece, was indebted to Etruria for whatever tended to elevate and

* Dennis, "Etruria," vol. i. pp. 21, 22.

humanize her, for her chief lessons in arts and science, for many of her political and most of her religious and social institutions, for the conveniences and enjoyments of peace, and the tactics and appliances of war—for almost everything, in short, that tended to exalt her as a nation, save her stern virtues, her thirst of conquest, and her indomitable courage, which were peculiarly her own." The Romans themselves, notwithstanding their intense national vanity, acknowledged this debt to some extent, and admitted that they derived from the Etruscans their augury, their religious ritual, their robes and other insignia of office, their games and shows, their earliest architecture, their calendar, their weights and measures, their land-surveying, and various other elements of their civilization. But there is reason to believe that their acknowledgments fell short of their obligations, and that Etruria was really the source of the *whole* early civilization of Rome, until the time came when—during the second Samnite war (B.C. 323–303—she was brought into contact with the luxury and refinement of the Greeks.

It is difficult to fix exactly the date at which Etruscan civilization commenced. Some of the most distinguished of modern historical critics * have main-

* K. O. Müller, in his "Etrusker" (iv. 7, 8, and "Einleitung," 2, 2), makes the commencement of the Etruscan era B.C. 1044. Niebuhr, in his "Roman History," carries back the date to B.C. 1188 (vol. i. p. 138, E. T.). Mr. F. Newman, in his "Regal Rome," while abstaining from any mention of a date, lays it down that "the Etruscans, in all civilizing art, were *exceedingly* in advance of the other nations of Italy," and "belonged to the *era of Phœnicia and of Egypt*" (p. 97).

tained that the great power, and with it the artistic eminence and social progress of this people, is to be carried back to a period anterior to B.C. 1000, and that, consequently, their civilization is to be regarded as parallel with that of the Phœnicians, of the Assyrians, of the early Iranians, and of the early or Vedic Indians. A theory has even been started recently * which would require us to enlarge this date considerably, and to regard the Etruscans as already one of the most powerful of European nations in the century between B.C. 1400 and B.C. 1300. But, on the whole, it seems to be most probable that the people did not greatly distinguish itself or come prominently into notice among the nations of the earth before the sixth, or at furthest the seventh, century B.C. There is no mention of the Etruscans in Homer. The earliest Greek writers in whose works the name occurs are Hesiod and Pindar among the poets,† and among the prose writers, Hecatæus, Hellanicus, and Herodotus.‡ In Hesiod (about B.C. 750) the use of the term is vague, designating the inhabitants of the Italic peninsula generally rather than any particular nation.§ It is not until about B.C. 550

* See the "Revue Archéologique" for 1867, and compare Lenormant, "Manuel d'Histoire ancienne de l'Orient," vol. i. p. 429, and the "Contemporary Review" for 1870, pp. 92—94.

† See Hesiod. "Theogon," l. 1015; Pind. "Pyth," i. 72 (Ed. Mommsen). Simonides, writing about the same time as Pindar, also mentions the Tyrsenians or Etruscans (Fr. 93, Ed. Gaisford).

‡ See Hecat. Fr. 25; Hellan. Fr. 1; Herod. i. 94, 166, etc.

§ Agrius and *Latinus* "rule over all the illustrious Tyrsenians." Compare Dionys. H. "Ant. Rom.," i. 25, who says that the Greeks confounded the Etruscans, Latins, Oscans, and Bruttians under the general name of Tyrrhenians.

that the Greeks become familiar with the real Etruscan people, who at that time hold, and had held for perhaps a century,* a species of maritime supremacy in the Western Mediterranean, where they had become celebrated for their naval skill and their piratical habits. With the conclusions which we thus derive from Greek literature agree fairly the Roman traditions, which place the great devolopment of Etruscan power in the second and third centuries of the city, or about B.C. 620–500.

The general character of Etruscan civilization has been already indicated; but the reader will probably expect a more detailed account of it. The standard works which describe it fully † are not very accessible; nor do our museums enable us to form a very exact notion of its nature. Beyond a copious display of what are called, somewhat loosely, "Etruscan vases," they contain little that bears upon the subject. The main monuments indicative of its character are in fact irremovable. They consist of massive walls, gateways, sewers, subterraneous tombs, rock-sculptures, and mural paintings inseparable from the stone-work which they decorate. They exist mainly on the sites of the ancient cities of Etruria, or in the cemeteries of the Etruscan people, and have, in comparatively

* See Ephorus, Fr. 52,

† Such as Inghirami, "Monumenti Etruschi," 7 vols. 4to; Micali, "Storia degli antichi popoli Italiani," 3 vols., and "Monumenti Inediti;" Abeken, "Mittel-Italien;" Dempster, "De Etrur. Reg.," 3 vols. folio, etc. Even Dennis, "Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria," 2 vols. 8vo., 1848, is a book not found in all libraries.

few instances, been torn from their natural resting-places to adorn the museums of Europe.

Etruscan architecture is remarkable for its massiveness. The chief remains of it are found in the walls and gates of cities, in sewers, bridges, vaults, and tombs. Etruscan town walls are of extraordinary strength and grandeur. They are of two kinds.* In the more northern parts of the country, where the rock is difficult to be hewn, being limestone, hard sandstone, or travertine, they are composed of huge blocks, tending to be rectangular, but of various sizes and irregular arrangement, with small pieces often inserted into the interstices of the larger blocks. This is the case at Volaterræ, at Populonia, at Rusellæ, and elsewhere. The blocks of stone in this style of building† are often eight or ten feet in length by three, four, and even five feet high. In the more southern districts, where the common material is *tufo*, a volcanic rock very easily worked, the masonry is of squared stone, and is very regular, but not particularly massive. Two styles are used. Sometimes the courses are similar, the blocks all exposing one of their long sides to the view; sometimes the wall is built in alternate courses, in the style which has been called *emplecton*,‡ the ends of the stones being exposed in one course, and the sides in the other. The blocks in this masonry have com-

* See Dennis, vol. i. "Introduction," p. lxiii.

† Ibid. vol. ii. pp. 151, 249, etc. One block measured by Mr. Dennis was 12 feet 8 inches long by nearly 3 feet broad.

‡ Vitruv. ii. v. 8, § 7.

monly a length of nearly four feet, with a height and width of two.*

Etruscan walls are occasionally flanked by towers,† which are of square construction, and project externally to a distance of twelve or fifteen feet. The walls are sometimes, even at the present time, forty feet high.‡ In thickness they vary greatly. Where they are built throughout of solid stone, their width is commonly not more than six or seven feet; but in cases where the solid masonry is confined to an internal and an external facing, the intervening space being stuffed with rubbish, the width is sometimes as much as sixteen or seventeen feet.§ The circumference is not, commonly, great, but in one instance has been calculated to exceed four miles.‖

In the earlier times Etruscan gateways were mere square openings in walls, guarded on either side by a stone doorpost, and covered in at top by a flat stone or wooden lintel; but after a while the use of the arch was introduced, and the gateway became an imposing feature. The arch was carried to a height of above twenty feet; the voussoirs and keystone were massive; an external moulding, in some instances, added dignity and richness, while an ornamentation by means of human heads in bold

* Dennis, vol. i. p. 88.

† Ibid. vol. i. pp. 133–135; vol. ii. pp. 271–273.

‡ Ibid. vol. ii. p. 151. Thirty feet seems to be a common height. (Dennis, vol. ii. pp. 154, 249, 272, etc.)

§ This is the case at Volaterræ (Dennis, vol. ii. p. 155).

‖ See Micali's "Antichi popoli Italiani," vol. i. p. 141, and vol. ii. p. 209. Compare Gori, "Mus. Etrus." vol. iii. p. 32.

relief introduced an element of interest or mystery. At the same time, for greater security, gateways were doubled. A short passage, of a very solid construction, led from a first archway to a second, where a second gate impeded the entrance of assailants; and a *cataracta*, or portcullis, could be lowered immediately behind the first gate, so that their retreat was cut off, and they were made prisoners. Interesting specimens of gateways thus guarded remain at Volaterræ, in the Porta all' Arco, and the Porta di Diana, which have been well described by Inghirami.*

The remains of sewers are found on the sites of almost all Etruscan towns; but the most perfect specimen of Etruscan skill in this respect is the Cloaca Maxima at Rome, which is still in an excellent state of preservation.† This is a culvert formed by a triple arch of the most massive character, the inner diameter of the innermost arch being fourteen feet, and the outer diameter of the outermost arch thirty-two feet. It was carried from the site of the old Forum to the Tiber, in a slightly circuitous course, a distance of about seven hundred yards, and may be ascended by a boat when the Tiber is low, the distance from the level of the water to the crown of the inner arch being at that time about six feet.

It is doubtful whether Etruscan bridges were

* See the "Monumenti Etruschi," vol. iv. pp. 160, *et seq.*

† For representations, see the article on the Cloaca in Dr. Smith's "Dict. of Antiquities," p. 299; and that on Rome in the same gentleman's "Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography," vol. ii. p. 815.

ever arched. Most probably they consisted of simple piers of stone, carried up a certain height from either side of the stream to be crossed, and then united by planks stretched from pier to pier, and by others connecting the piers with roadways upon either bank. A specimen, believed to contain Etruscan work,* still exists at Vulci, where three projecting buttresses of red tufo, much weather-worn, are embedded in masonry of a different age and material, and united by arches of Roman construction. It is thought† that these buttresses, or piers, originally stood alone, and sustained a horizontal, and perhaps movable frame of woodwork, like that which is known to have existed for many ages at Rome, in the case of the Pons Sublicius.

Etruscan vaults are of two kinds. The more curious, and probably the most ancient, are *false* arches,‡ formed of horizontal courses of stone, each a little overlapping the other, and carried on until the aperture at the top could be closed by a single superincumbent slab. Such is the construction of the Regulini-Galassi vault at Cervetri, the ancient Cære, which is twenty yards in length, though less than five feet in breadth, and only a little above six feet high. But it is far more common to find in Etruria vaults perfectly arched in the ordinary way with voussoirs, or wedge-shaped stones.§ These are

* Dennis, vol. i. p. 401.

† Lenoir in the "Ann. Inst." for 1832, p. 261.

‡ Dennis, vol. ii. p. 46.

§ Ibid. pp. 376, 441, 488, etc.

neatly fitted to each other, and are generally uncemented. The blocks composing them vary from seven or even eight feet in length to two or three feet, and from a width of ten inches to a foot and a half.

It is probable that these vaults were in most instances intended for tombs; but the more ordinary tombs of the Etruscans were chambers, hewn out of the rock, often of a considerable size, so as almost to resemble houses, and sometimes with external façades of a highly ornamental character. The "temple-tombs" at Norchia are especially remarkable.* A wall of rock is hewn into a representation of two temples—Doric in general character, but with peculiar features. Each rose up into a pediment, which was richly adorned with sculpture, while below, on the entablatures, were *guttæ* and triglyphs. The entablatures were each of them supported by at least six square pillars, detached from the rocky face behind them; and this rocky face was—at least in one instance—decorated with a splendid bas-relief (representing a procession of strange figures decidedly archaic and Etruscan), the effect of which was heightened by a delicate colouring, still to be traced upon the background, and, in places, upon the figures. The interiors of the Norchia temple-tombs are mean; but elsewhere the sepulchral chamber had often considerable magnificence. In some the plan of a house was closely followed.† A

* For a representation, see Dennis, vol. i. p. 243; and for a full description see the same writer, vol. i. pp. 249–255.

† Ibid. vol. ii. p. 32.

flight of descending steps gave entrance into a vestibule, on either side of which were chambers (*triclinia*); beyond, a doorway led into the principal chamber, or *atrium*, out of which opened further *triclinia*. The ceilings were carved into an imitation of beams and rafters crossing each other; armchairs, with footstools attached, stood against the walls, from which weapons or other articles were suspended. In other cases the tomb consisted mainly of a single large chamber, which was ornamented with paintings or with inscriptions. The "tomb of the Tarquins," at Cervetri, is thirty-five feet square, and supported by two massive pillars in the middle;* that of the Cæcinæ, at Volaterræ, is circular, supported by a single pillar, and with a diameter of forty feet.† The paintings in the tombs most commonly represent banqueting scenes; but encounters with wild beasts and other hunting scenes, representations of fabulous animals or of games and sports, and scenes from the mythology, are not uncommon. The colours are in some instances faded, but in others as vivid as when first laid on. Occasionally, but very rarely,‡ sculpture takes the place of painting, and reliefs, representing men and horses, and wild beasts in combat or devouring their prey, cover the walls of the sepulchral chambers, extending from the

* Dennis, vol. ii. p. 43.

† Inghirami, "Monumenti Etruschi," vol. iv. p. 85.

‡ As at Tarquinii on the tomb called "La Mercareccia" (Gori, "Mus. Etrusc.," vol. iii. p. 90), at Cervetri in the "Grotto del Triclinio" (Dennis, vol. ii. p. 35), and at Chiusi (ibid. p. 375, note).

floor to the ceiling, and giving great richness to the apartments.

The æsthetic art of the Etruscans comprises statuary, painting, engraving, modelling in clay, and casting and chiselling in bronze. Except in the case of recumbent figures on tombs, their statuary is not often "in the round." Some ten or a dozen erect figures, in stone or marble, mostly mutilated, have been found, which, with more or less of probability, may be pronounced Etruscan. They have seldom much merit. Some are exceedingly quaint and archaic in character, as the lady figured by Mr. Dennis in his first volume;* others have not much to distinguish them from Roman work. Recumbent figures on sarcophagi are common. They are in general stiff, and have a conventional air; all lean on their left elbow, and have the right arm stretched along the body; the right hand commonly holds a goblet. The execution is for the most part somewhat coarse, and there is evidence of a want of artistic feeling in the fact that originally the figures were wholly covered with paint. On the other hand we are told that in some cases the heads are in excellent taste, the faces being "full of character," and the features occasionally "Grecian." †

The bas-reliefs are of a higher order than the statues. They are almost always vigorous, and though sometimes quaint and even grotesque in portions, are never wanting in life, spirit, and action.

* Page 422.

† Dennis, vol. i. pp. 446, 447.

The subjects represented seem to be most commonly Greek; but there is no close imitation of Greek models, and the beauty and grace which characterize the production of the Hellenic artists are never reached. The reliefs, moreover, like the statues, appear to have been disfigured by a coarse, unnatural, and inharmonious colouring, which must have greatly detracted from their merit as works of high art.

Etruscan paintings are said to fall into four classes.* Those of the earliest period present Egyptian and Babylonian analogies. They are wholly religious, deities or mythological emblems being the only subjects represented. The drawing is stiff and rigid; the drapery adheres closely to the form; the figures are in bad proportion, limbs and bodies being unduly elongated; and the artist seldom ventures to represent his figures otherwise than in profile. Quaint and strange animals, chimæras, sphinxes, gorgons, griffins, centaurs, belong especially to this stage; four-winged deities are common; the flowers and foliage are of unnatural shapes, and the colouring is strange and unpleasant. In the second period, "Etruscan art stepped out of the conventionalities which confined it, and assumed a more energetic character—more like the Greek than the Egyptian, yet still rigid, hard, and dry, rather akin to the Æginetic than the Attic school, displaying more force than beauty, more vigour than grace, better intention than ability of execution, an exaggerated, not a

* Dennis, "Introduction," pp. lxxviii—lxxxiii.

truthful representation of nature."* This second period was followed by a third, in which the Etruscan artists became the servile imitators of the Greeks, whose works they copied, and whose entire manner they adopted, so that it is difficult to distinguish between the productions of the two peoples. Finally, there was a period of decadence, in which drawing became careless, composition over-complex, attitudes affected, and ornament too much sought after. Art "forgot her sublime and godlike simplicity, to trick herself out in meretricious embellishments." Purity and chasteness of design and delicacy of execution disappeared. The time of perfection was gone by, and Etruscan painting entered upon the period of corruption and decay.

Among the most curious and artistic of all the productions of Etruria are the bronzes. These include a great variety of articles, such as couches, tripods, caskets, cauldrons, shields, censers, helmets, cuirasses, daggers, spear-heads, arrow-heads, vases, ewers, and the like; but the most remarkable are the statues, the candelabra, and the engraved disks or mirrors. The bronze bust of an Etruscan lady, found in a tomb at Vulci, and figured by Dennis twice,† is among the most curious specimens of their early art which has come down to us. It is not cast, but formed of thin plates of bronze hammered into shape,

* Dennis, "Introduction," p. lxviii.

† In vol. i. p. 423, and vol. ii. p. 536. A very quaint bronze statuette of a somewhat similar character is figured by Micali ("Antichi Monumenti," p. xv.).

and finished with the chisel. The features are repulsive, the right arm is ill modelled, and the bust is too small for the head; but the archaic and *native* character of the whole is most interesting, and the pedestal is exceedingly handsome. It is adorned with figures in three rows, the top and bottom rows containing processions of lions, while the intermediate one exhibits sphinxes, human figures, and bigæ. Altogether, the work is one of the most characteristic that we possess. It shows traces of Egyptian, and perhaps of Assyrian influence,* but is manifestly a genuine native product, and must belong to an early period. The bronze statues of the later times are very different. Ordinarily they are cast in clay, and imitate Greek models, but have very little merit.

Ancient art has produced few things more elegant than Etruscan candelabra. The Athenians are said to have imported them in the time of Pericles, † and the museums of Europe contain several of extraordinary beauty. ‡ The base is commonly a tripod, composed of three legs of animals, or of three human forms bent backwards. The stem rises to a great height, and is twisted or fluted; sometimes it springs from one statuette, and is surmounted by another; fre-

* Compare Layard, "Nineveh and Babylon," p. 190, where the resemblance of the figures on the pedestal to those on bronzes found at Nineveh is noted.

† Athenæus. "Deipnosophist," i. 22, p. 28, and xv. 18, p. 700.

‡ Two in the Museo Gregoriano at Rome, and one in the Museum of Volaterræ have special merit. They are figured by Dennis, vol. ii. pp. 204 and 514. (Compare also vol. i. "Introduction," p. lxx.)

quently it is ornamented by figures of animals, which seem to be climbing up it. At the top there is a cup for a lamp, often decorated with figures of birds.

The engraved mirrors of Etruria are curious, but less interesting than the paintings on vases and tombs. They are either pear-shaped or circular, and contain, generally within a wreath of leaves, some scene from the Greek or the native mythology, * or some representation of Etruscan life and manners. Occasionally the drawing has an elevation and perfection which leaves nothing to be desired; but more commonly the style is mediocre, being either rude and coarse, or affected and negligent; belonging either to the infancy of art, or to its decay and decrepitude.

In fictile art the Etruscans equalled, if they did not even excel, any other nation. Granting that a very large number of the vases discovered in the country, which are to be counted by hundreds, or even thousands, in all the great collections of Europe, † were importations from Greece, or from the East, yet still there can be no reasonable doubt that many—the majority probably—were of native manufacture. Peculiarities of style attach to the vases of each

* See Mr. Isaac Taylor's "Etruscan Researches," p. 104, and the Frontispiece to Mr. Dennis's "Etruria." On the general subject of Etruscan mirrors the standard work is Gerhard's "Etruskische Spiegel," which is richly illustrated.

† The Museo Gregoriano at Rome contains four rooms of vases; the Museo Campana is also rich in them; the Volaterræ Museum has above four hundred; but it may be doubted whether the British Museum collection is excelled by any foreign one.

locality; many have Etruscan inscriptions; where the inscription is Greek, it is often mis-spelt in such a way as to indicate that the artist was a foreigner. Add to this that many varieties of form are found in Etruria which do not exist elsewhere, and the conclusion is inevitable that, however large the importation, there was also a native manufacture; and that, in fact, wherever originated, the art of making and painting vases was carried to a higher pitch of development in Etruria than in any other locality. If, then, we regard the vessels found in the tombs as mainly, or, at any rate, as largely Etruscan, we cannot fail to admire the skill and taste of the people as exhibited in their production. The varieties are almost infinite, the forms always tasteful, sometimes exquisite, the patterns charming, the paintings spirited. If, as is probable, the most meritorious are pure Greek, still, in the remainder there is enough of taste and skill to indicate a very high degree of artistic excellence, and to excite our surprise and admiration.

Besides their vases, the Etruscans modelled figures in clay, which have often considerable merit. One of Adonis, in the Museo Gregoriano, is greatly admired.* Figures of gods—especially the Novensiles—are common. There are others of women, of children, and even of infants, all beautiful in their way, modelled with good taste and carefully finished. The animal heads, in which the *rhyta*, or drinking-

* Dennis, "Etruria," vol. ii. p. 496; Abeken, "Mittel-Italien," p. 367.

cups, ordinarily terminated, are also excellently rendered.*

We are told that the Etruscans had considerable skill in music. The trumpet was generally regarded by the ancients as of their invention ;† and the vases often represent bands of trumpeters, fifers, and harpers, who play apparently in concert. The double-pipe is also common in the paintings ; the tambourine, flute, and Pan's-pipe appear occasionally ; and castanets are frequent. Dancing usually accompanied the music, and in this both sexes participated ; but the dancers seem, in all cases, to have been professionals, whose services were hired, the employment being deemed a low one, in which those who wished to be thought respectable must not participate.

In physical comfort and luxury, in the elegance of their houses, the richness and variety of their dress, the magnificence of their personal ornaments, the beauty and taste of their furniture, the grandeur of their processions, the splendour of their banquets, the multitude of their sports and games, the Etruscans can scarcely have been surpassed by any contemporary, or, indeed, by any ancient nation. The paintings show us banqueting scenes, where figures, male and female, clothed in richly-embroidered garments, recline on elegant couches

* For a representation, see Dennis, vol. i., "Introduction," p. 99.

† Æschyl. "Eumenides," l. 570 ; Sophocl. "Ajax," l. 17 ; Virg. "Æn.," viii. 526 ; Diod. Sic., v. p. 316 ; Strab., v. p. 220 ; Sil. Ital., ii. 19 ; Athen., "Deipn.," iv. p. 184 ; Pollus, iv. 11, etc.

under flowered coverlets, feasting to the sound of lyres and pipes; a multitude of handsome slaves, magnificently apparelled, stand around, some waiting their master's orders, others replenishing the silver goblets from the wine-jars on a sideboard hard by; while a train of dancers, male and female, clad in gauzy robes, and wearing chaplets of myrtle, or rich jewels, entertain the feasters with their lively steps and graceful movements, some of them piping as they dance.* Ancient authors tell us that the Etruscans indulged in banquets of this description twice a day.† It was characteristic of the Etruscan manners that women took their place at the board by their husbands' side, and shared the banquet, unless it was one where the drinking was to be carried to excess.

In the higher elements of civilization, in religious ideas, in law and government, in morality, and again in science and literature, there is no reason to believe that the Etruscans ever made any great advance. Their religion was a low form of nature-worship combined with Shamanism, or a belief in the magical powers of their diviners (haruspices), and with a cult of the deceased spirits of each man's family.‡ It was disgraced by gloomy rites, extreme superstition, and the iniquity of human sacrifice.§

* Compare Dennis's "Etruria," vol. i. pp. 282—293.

† Diod. Sic., v. p. 316; Athen. "Deipn.," iv. 13, p. 153.

‡ See Mr. Isaac Taylor's "Etruscan Researches," pp. 86—93.

§ Human sacrifice is represented on the remains in a way that shows it was practised. (See Dennis, vol. i. p. 447; vol. ii. p. 97, note.) There can be little doubt that the Romans took the custom,

The divinities worshipped were viewed as maleficent rather than beneficent, as objects of fear rather than of love. The priests, as their ministers, were regarded with an awful dread; they "wielded the double-edged sword of secular and ecclesiastical authority,"* crushed all free thought, and imposed upon the people the tyranny of a minute and all-pervading ceremonialism. Even the strong belief in a future life, which was a leading feature of the religion, did little to elevate it; for the Etruscan's thoughts upon the subject were divided between a dread of the malignant demons, who would delight in torturing his soul, and the hope of a paradise of mere sensual enjoyment.

In government, Etruria was a narrow oligarchy of a theocratic character. The Lucumones were at once the civil rulers, the landed proprietors, and the priests and augurs of the nation, alone acquainted with the will of heaven, and alone able, by appeasing angry gods, to avert disaster, and prevent national calamity. Under such a government class interests were of course solely considered; and the condition of the bulk of the population was rude and depressed, not to say wretched. There was no separation of the various functions of governors. The same men made the laws, imposed the taxes, administered the state, decided causes, and commanded armies. In one respect only did the Etruscans show any germ of

which they certainly practised in ancient times, from the Etruscans.

* Dennis, vol. i. "Introduction," p. l.

real political intelligence. At a time when the rest of Italy was divided up among a number of petty states, continually at war one with another, they formed a wide-spreading confederacy, which, though perhaps rather religious than civil, * yet succeeded in holding together the several communities, in preventing them from wasting each other's strength by internal struggles, and in uniting them under the pressure of external danger into a body possessing considerable strength and coherence. The federal idea, which in Greece scarcely bore any real fruit until after the time of Alexander, † was appreciated in Italy many centuries earlier, and, though not confined to the Etruscans, was apparently recognized by them more distinctly, and at an earlier period, than by any other Italic nation.

But little can be said in favour of Etruscan morality. The men bore a reputation, not merely for self-indulgent and luxurious habits, but for actual gluttony; ‡ and the women are said to have been almost universally profligate. § We see by the representation in the tombs that dances of a

* See Mr. Bunbury's article in Dr. W. Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography," i. v. ETRURIA; vol. i., p. 864. (V. Political Constitution.)

† In the Achæan and Ætolian Leagues the true federal idea was carried out, not so in the early Bœotian, Thessalian, Ionian, Delian confederacies. See Mr. Freeman's useful work on "Federal Governments." (When will he give us another instalment of it?)

‡ Compare the "*pinguis* Tyrrhenus" of Virgil ("Georg.," ii., 193), and the "*obesus* Etruscus" of Catullus (xxxix. 11).

§ Plaut. "Cistell.," ii. 3, 20; Theopomp. ap. Athen. "Deipn.," xii. 3, p. 515; Horat. "Od.," iii. 10, 11.

licentious description were witnessed without a blush by assemblages comprising both sexes. Nor was this looseness of manners compensated for by softness of temper or gentleness of behaviour towards others. The Etruscans were proverbially harsh in their treatment of their serf population, * and often drove these wretched dependants into rebellion; and the cruelties of which their pirates were guilty towards their unhappy captives are but too notorious. †

What progress the Etruscans made in science and literature it is somewhat difficult to determine. They certainly possessed letters from a very early date, and seem to have derived them straight from Asia, not mediately through the Greeks. ‡ We hear of their having produced a native literature, comprising, besides religious and ritual books, histories, tragedies, and poems; § but the character of these works is unknown to us, and we can form no judgment of their merit. The drama, which the Romans derived from them, || was evidently of a rude and coarse character; nor is it probable that their other literary efforts were much superior. Their engineering science was, it is clear, respect-

* Martial, ix. 23, 4.

† Servius ad. Virg. "Æn.," viii. 479.

‡ This has been denied (Müller, "Etrusker," iv. 6, 1; Bunbury, in Smith's Dictionary, etc.), but seems to me almost certain. (See Fellows' "Lycia," page 442.)

§ Polyb. ii. 17; Varro ap. Censorin. xvii. 6, and "Ling. Lat.," v. 55; Dionys. Hal. i. p. 17; Serv. ad Virg. "Æn." viii. 285; Lucret. vi. 381, etc.

|| Liv. vii. 2.

able. They constructed arches of a fair size, tunnelled through rocks, gave their buildings vaulted roofs, raised into place vast masses of stone, and thus were able to form edifices of a most solid and permanent character. But it is not certain that they possessed any other science worthy of the name. Such astronomical knowledge as they enjoyed was probably obtained from Asia,* and was empirical rather than scientific. Their meteorology was vitiated by being accommodated to superstitious fancies. It is their art, not their science, which is their true glory, and which, almost alone, gives them their high place among the pioneers of civilization.

* Niebuhr asserts the contrary ("Hist. of Rome," vol. i. p. 137, E. T.), but adduces no grounds for his opinion. He even assigns to the Etruscans a native "medicine" and native "physics."

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE CIVILIZATION OF THE BRITISH CELTS.

Supposed high antiquity of Celtic civilization in Britain—Contradicted by Cæsar, Strabo, Diodorus, and others—Account given by Cæsar—Accounts of Diodorus and Strabo—Accounts of Tacitus—Theory that the civilized Celts were those of the interior, contradicted by Cæsar—Conclusions of archæologists on the subject—Monuments of the Celtic period—Cromlechs—Pottery—Tools and implements—Druid's circles—Stonehenge and Avebury—Amount of mechanical skill implied in these works not great—No astronomical knowledge implied in them—Low character of the Celtic civilization before the Roman invasion.

A CONSIDERABLE antiquity has been claimed by some writers for the civilization of the British Celts. The late Archdeacon Williams, a man of much acuteness and of considerable learning, maintained, in more than one of his works,* that civilization had commenced in Britain as early as B.C. 1000, and that by the year B.C. 400—three centuries and a half before the first invasion of our island by the Romans—the progress made was such as to entitle

* See his "Gomer" (London, 1850), and also his "Ecclesiastical History of the Cymry" (London, 1844).

the British race to a high position among the nations which then held possession of the earth. "Our memorials point," he said, "to eras and instances in which the civil arts and sciences were cultivated to an extent that would not have degraded (disgraced?) the best ages of Greece and Rome."* The Britons, he thought, possessed, before the Romans came, an extensive literature in prose and verse, a refined science of music, a knowledge of astronomy based on the use of telescopes, a great skill in mechanics, a good system of agriculture, considerable commerce, some acquaintance with metallurgy and medicine, a high moral teaching, an admirable code of laws, and a very fair appreciation of the science of politics.† He based his conclusions mainly on the view that the Welsh poems called "The Triads" might be relied upon as giving an authentic account of the early history of the nation,‡ derived from ancient tradition, and committed to writing at least as far back as the fourth century before our era. He summed up his conclusions on the entire subject, very confidently, in the following words: "Thus it appears that our British ancestors, instead of being a nation of barbarians and savages, as they are too commonly represented, were really an enlightened people [at the time of the Roman invasion], far

* "Eccles. History of the Cymry," p. 30.

† Ibid. pp. 31—37.

‡ See the "Preface to the Ecclesiastical History," p. viii., where Mr. Williams says of the Triads, "Indeed they are the authorities which may be said to impart to this work its peculiar character, or to *form the basis on which it stands.*"

advanced in civilization and intellectual improvement."*

The main objection to this view, which naturally occurs to every one on first becoming acquainted with it, is the fact that it is wholly irreconcilable with the account given us of Britain by Cæsar, and confirmed by other writers, as especially Strabo, Diodorus, and Tacitus. Cæsar tells us that† the natives in his time were not generally agriculturists, but lived on milk and meat, and clothed themselves with skins. They dyed their skin with a blue tint made from woad, to give them a more terrible appearance in battle; they wore their hair long, and shaved all their body except the head and the upper lip. They fought chiefly on horseback or from chariots, and attacked with howls and shouts, with which they expected to frighten the enemy. Each man had a single wife; but the members of a family, or of a village, held their wives in common. Their "towns" for the most part consisted of a space in the fastnesses of the woods, surrounded by a mound and trench, and calculated to afford them a retreat and protection from hostile invasion. They had no coined money, but made use, instead, of bronze or iron bars, of a certain fixed weight. They were divided into numerous petty tribes, often at war one with another, and entirely devoid of anything like unity or cohesion, even under the pressure of a foreign invasion. Their religion was apparently the

* "Eccles. History," p. 38.

† See the "Commentarii de Bello Gallico," v. 12—15.

same as that of the Gauls*—a dark and gloomy superstition, involving subjection to a priest-caste, the Druids, and requiring the continual sacrifice by fire of numerous human victims for the appeasing of the Divine anger.† Cæsar is not aware that the Britons had a literature, or even letters; he assigns them no science, unless science is included in the religious knowledge, in which he regarded the British Druids as excelling those of Gaul.‡ The only commerce of which he speaks as having come to his knowledge is an importation into Britain of bronze.

Diodorus and Strabo, who wrote in the reign of Augustus, confirm generally the statements of Cæsar, but add various particulars. Diodorus describes the ordinary dwelling-places of the Britons as mere temporary establishments, formed in the forests by enclosing a space with felled trees, within which were made huts of reeds and logs, and sheds for cattle, "not intended to last very long."§ Strabo says the Britons were complete strangers both to agriculture and to gardening, and notes further that

* Ibid. vi. 13: "Disciplina in Britannia reperta, atque inde in Galliam translata." Cæsar's meaning would perhaps be doubtful, if we did not find, from later Roman writers, that Druidism flourished in Britain.

† "Immani magnitudine simulacra habent, quorum contexta viminibus membra vivis hominibus complent: quibus succensis circumventi flamma exanimantur homines" ("De Bell. Gall." vi. 16).

‡ Cæsar assigns some astronomical knowledge to the Gaulish Druids. "Multa de sideribus atque eorum motu," he says, "de mundi ac terrarum magnitudine, de rerum natura, de deorum immortalium vi ac potestate disputant et juventuti tradunt" (Ibid. vi. 14).

§ Diod. Sic. v. 21.

they fell behind most pastoral nations, inasmuch as they were unacquainted with the manufacture of cheese.* Diodorus differs from Strabo in representing the bulk of the British nation as agricultural, and says they "stored the corn, which they grew, in the stalk, in thatched houses,"† which is perhaps his way of describing ricks. Both Strabo and Diodorus represent the British trade as considerable. They speak of tin as largely exported by the Britons, who also made a profit by the export of slaves and dogs. They imported, according to Strabo, besides bronze, ivory bracelets, necklaces, and various small wares, including vessels of glass.

The unsubdued Britons, whom Tacitus describes, were, according to his accounts, "barbarians," more ferocious than the Gauls.‡ They had the same religion as the Gauls, but were even deeper sunk in superstition.§ Their orgies took place in the depths of sacred groves, where the blood of human victims flowed freely from the altars, and the will of the gods was discovered from an inspection of the still palpitating entrails.‖ The disunion that had rendered the rest of the nation an easy prey to Rome's disciplined bands continued, and it was seldom that any two states could be induced to make common cause against a foreign foe.¶ The style of warfare

* Strab. iv. p. 138.

† Diod. Sic. l.s.c.

‡ Tacit. "Agricola," sec. 11.

§ Ibid. Compare "Ann." xiv. 30.

‖ "Cruore capsivo adolere aras et hominum fibris consulere Deos fas habebant." Tacit. "Ann." l.s.c.

¶ "Agricola," sec. 12.

in vogue was rude and primitive; the chief dependence was still placed on chariots; tactics were ignored; and every battle was an attempt to overwhelm the Romans by the mere preponderance of brute force. The arms of the Britons were contemptible; their swords were unduly long and had no points;* the size of their shields was small; and they were without breast-plates or other defensive armour. Altogether the picture drawn is that of a race who, if not actual savages, are at any rate not very far removed from the savage condition, and of whom it is quite absurd to say that "they were really an enlightened people, far advanced in civilization and intellectual improvement." †

Archdeacon Williams endeavoured to meet the argument drawn from the statements of Cæsar, and supported by the general *consensus* of the classical writers, by asserting that the really civilized Celts had retreated before Cæsar's time into the western parts of Britain, and that he consequently never came into contact with them,‡ but only with some comparatively barbarous tribes, who had recently invaded the island from the Continent. But it is unfortunate for this theory that Cæsar himself distinctly states that the inhabitants of the part of Britain which he invaded were "the most civilized of all" (humanissimi), and that the tribes of

* "Agricola," sec. 36.

† Williams's "Eccles. Hist.," p. 38.

‡ Ibid. p. 49.

the interior were ruder and more backward.* It is also to be noted that his account is corroborated by the later Latin writers, † who distinctly show that the Romans, as they advanced into the island, fell in with races less and less civilized, until they came in Scotland to tribes whom they had a right to call absolute "barbarians," the Ottadini, Horestii, and Mæatæ, who held the country north of the Tyne and Irthing. ‡

Again, if, discarding the accounts of writers who (it may be argued) cared to know but little of a people in whom they felt no interest, we throw ourselves upon archæological facts, and inquire what they have to tell us with respect to the condition of the British Celts prior to the Roman invasion, we shall find additional reason to misdoubt the views of the enthusiastic Archdeacon, and to conclude that the ante-Roman civilization of Britain, if it deserves the name at all, was of a very low

* "De Bell. Gall.," v. 14.

† Dean Merivale throws a slight shadow of doubt on Cæsar's veracity, on the ground that the later writers, such as Dio Cassius and Tacitus, say nothing of "the painted bodies, the scythed chariots, the hideous sacrifices, and the revolting concubinage" of the Britons ("Roman Empire," vol. vi. p. 224, note). It must be allowed that they do not; but is not the supposition that a hundred years of intercourse with the Romans themselves and with the Romanized Gauls and Germans of the opposite coast had produced the change, a more probable explanation of the difficulty than one which taxes the great Julius with an intentional misrepresentation, designed to cover his own failures, and prevent them from being too jealously scrutinized?

‡ See Dean Merivale's "Roman Empire," vol. vii., page 324 (edition of 1865).

order. If we ask a temperate archæologist * what ancient remains existing in our island may be reasonably assigned to the pre-Roman Celts, he will point in the first place to the class of megalithic monuments called "cromlechs," and say, "these are almost certainly pre-Roman;" † next, he will point to a certain amount of pottery, chiefly sun-baked; ‡ and, thirdly, to various weapons, tools, and ornaments of stone, flint, spar, or bone, which he will say are probably to a large extent pre-Roman, though many, not distinguishable from the rest, may belong to Roman, or even to later times. § Finally, he will point, but very doubtfully, || to the great stones arranged in a circular form, and generally known as "Druids' circles," which occur in various parts of England, more especially in the west and in the north, beginning with a diameter of sixty feet, and with stones about the height of a man, and culminating in the gigantic monuments of Avebury and Stonehenge, where the area is 1,400 feet, and the height of the largest stones twenty or twenty-one feet. These, he will say, are probably Celtic; but whether pre-Roman or not, he will scarcely venture to determine.

* Such as Mr. Thomas Wright, from whose sensible work, "The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon," the following remarks are for the most part taken. The quotations follow the edition of 1873.

† Wright's "Celt, Roman, and Saxon," pp. 72—75.

‡ Ibid. pp. 93—95.

§ Ibid. pp. 4, 95—98, 116—118.

|| "It is remarkable," observes Mr. Wright, "that the only excavation within the area of Stonehenge, of which we possess any account, *brought to light Roman remains*" (p. 108).

Now, if we allow all these remains, even the last, to be native Celtic—produced, *i.e.*, by the Celts themselves without foreign assistance—what amount of civilization do they imply? The cromlechs are sepulchral chambers of a very rude kind. They consist usually of four stones, three forming the walls of the chamber, while the fourth serves to roof it in, the remaining side being left open. There has been no shaping of the stones by art; they are as they have come out of the quarry, or as they have been found on the earth's surface. The size and weight of the stones are considerable, but still not such as to imply any very great mechanical skill in those who moved them and emplaced them as they are found. Each cromlech was originally covered by a mound or barrow, which may in some cases have attained a height of fifty feet. Erections of this character are indications of a civilization very much below that of the Lydians * of the sixth century B.C., which (as we have seen) was not very advanced.

The pottery of the Celtic Britons is remarkably coarse and rude. The shapes have little elegance; the patterning is of the simplest kind, consisting of dots, parallel lines, crosses, and sometimes zigzags, which are scratched upon the surface, apparently with a pointed stick; † handles, where they exist at

* The present height of the barrow of Alyattes is about 150 feet. The sepulchral chamber enclosed within it indicates a civilization very much beyond that required to construct a cromlech.

† Wright, p. 93.

all, are mere loops, intended probably to have cords passed through them by which the vessels might be suspended. Most of the vessels are merely sun-dried; though some, found commonly in the more southern parts of England, have been placed in a kiln and baked.*

The weapons, tools, and ornaments found with the pottery above described, are for the most part either of stone or bronze. The stone tools and weapons are mostly merely chipped into shape; but occasionally specimens are met with which must have been formed by some machine like a lathe.† The tools comprise axes, chisels, gimlets, and saws; the weapons are chiefly spear-heads and arrow-heads. These last are sometimes beautifully finished. The bronze implements are most commonly of the class which has been denominated "celts," from the Latin *celtis*, "a chisel."‡ With these are found punches, gouges, and other similar tools, and also numerous spear-heads and arrow-heads, with an occasional dagger or sword. The swords greatly resemble the Roman, and it is a question whether they were not imported from the Continent. In a few instances traces of armour have been found, and

* Wright, p. 94.

† Ibid. p. 98.

‡ See Hearne's "Discourse concerning some Antiquities found in Yorkshire," printed as an appendix to the first volume of his edition of Leland's "Itinerary," where the name of "celtes" is first applied to these implements. The resemblance of the word to the ethnic name, Celt, has unfortunately given rise to the wholly mistaken idea that the implements are peculiar to that people.

in one the breast of a skeleton was covered with a corselet of thin gold, embossed with an ornamentation resembling nail-heads and lines.*

Finally, with regard to the "Druids' circles," we may set aside the smaller ones, which are at least as rude as the cromlechs, and which appear to have been mere supports, designed to prevent the giving way of barrows or sepulchral mounds, and confining ourselves to the consideration of the larger, such as Stonehenge and Avebury, inquire, Is there anything in them which really implies *great* mechanical skill, or "a proficiency in the science of astronomy"?† Now certainly they are in advance of the cromlechs. They "differ from other Celtic stone ornaments in the circumstance that the stones have been hewn and squared with tools, and that each of the upright stones had two tenons or projections on the top, which fitted into notches or hollows in the superincumbent slabs."‡ The largest of the upright stones being twenty-one feet in height, and these sustaining imposts of many tons in weight, the architects must have possessed the power of raising such vast masses to the height at which they are found, and of manipulating them at that height, so as to insert the tenons into the mortices. As, moreover, the quality of the stones is in many cases such as is quite unknown in the neighbourhood, there must have

* See Wright, p. 105.

† So Archdeacon Williams ("Eccles. History of the Cymry, p. 36).

‡ Wright, p. 79.

been possessed by the builders a power of conveying such masses by land—for water-carriage is out of the question—a very considerable distance, perhaps as much as thirty or forty miles.* These are the indications that Stonehenge and Avebury give of mechanical knowledge and skill. We have to consider to what they amount.

Now the conveyance of large masses of stone in a tolerably level country to a distance from the place where they were quarried, implies no very great mechanical knowledge—it is simply a question of the application to the proposed end of a large amount of muscular force, animal or human. Both the Egyptians and the Assyrians conveyed their colossal figures for considerable distances by the simple expedient of placing them upon a wooden sledge, whereto they attached ropes, by means of which gangs of men dragged them to the point required.† The weight of the Assyrian colossi is estimated at from forty-to fifty tons,‡ that of the Egyptian is often very much greater. § The largest of the stones at Avebury and Stonehenge do not, it is probable, exceed half this weight.

With regard to the raising of large stones into place, the Egyptians we know, elevated them by

* A portion of the blocks at Stonehenge is thought to have been brought from Devonshire (Wright, p. 83), there being no stone of the quality nearer than that county.

† See Layard's "Nineveh and Babylon," pp. 106–116.

‡ Ibid. p. 110.

§ One Egyptian colossus is estimated by Sir G. Wilkinson to have weighed 887 tons! ("Ancient Egyptians," vol. iii. p. 331).

means of machines,* which must have resembled our own cranes; but it is not necessary to suppose that mechanical appliances of this description were in use among the Celtic architects. More probably they employed inclined planes of earth or stone, up which the blocks were dragged, still on their sledges, and having in this way brought them to the required height, emplaced them by sheer muscular strength upon the uprights. The covering stones of cromlechs were doubtless raised into place by the same means, the mound being then continued above them, whereas at Stonehenge and Avebury after it had served its purpose it was cleared away.

It would seem, therefore, that even the greatest of the Celtic monuments imply no more than a moderate amount of mechanical ingenuity in the people who constructed them. How they can be supposed to indicate "proficiency in the science of astronomy" it is difficult to conceive. Circles of thirty stones indeed are found, in which a lively imagination may conjecture a reference to the lunar month. But on the whole it is only by a series of the most arbitrary and forced interpretations that either the numbers or the proportions can be argued to have an astronomical bearing. It is not unlikely that the circles were temples, and it is quite possible that in some of them the special object of worship may have been the sun; † but beyond this we have

* Herod. ii. 125.

† The late Professor Phillips (of Oxford) informed me that, in the direction of the main avenue of approach at Stonehenge, and

really no data for determining the aim or intention of the structures in question.

On the whole, the conclusion seems forced upon us that the British Celts, though not absolute savages, had succeeded in developing only a very low type of civilization before the Roman conquest. They were not, perhaps, wholly ignorant of letters, but they made little use of them; they knew something, but not very much, of metallurgy, of mechanics, of agriculture, of the art of pottery; they had domesticated horses and horned cattle; they could weave; they could construct chariots; they had constructed a system of roads; but they were wretchedly lodged and clothed; their houses were of the meanest description; they wore war-paint and sought to frighten a disciplined enemy by their cries and shouts; their religion was a debased and gloomy superstition; their political organization was the weakest possible; their tombs, on which they bestowed great pains, were rude and clumsy; their temples, if the so-called "Druids' circles" are the remains of temples, were grotesque. We can see no sufficient reason for regarding the British Celts as more advanced than their kindred in Gaul,* whom

in the position of certain detached stones with respect to the central triliths, he thought he saw the indications of solar worship. That the sun (Apollo) was worshipped by the Celts, is stated by Cæsar ("Bell. Gall." vi. 17).

* In most respects the Gallic Celts were in advance of the British. They had *cities*, which were strongly walled, and which the Romans had to take by regular sieges ("Bell. Gall." vii. 17–18); they had extensive ironworks (ibid. vii. 22); they made use of letters (ibid. i. 29, vi. 14; compare Strab. iv. p. 181); they

no writer, so far as we are aware, claims to have been a civilized nation.

built bridges over their rivers ("Bell. Gall." ii. 5); they had ships, in which they were in the habit of crossing the Channel between Gaul and Britain (ibid. iii. 8); they possessed a considerable trade (Strab. iv. page 189; Diod. Sic. v. 22); they had a native coinage before Cæsar's invasion (See Mr. Long's note, p. 69 of his edition of the "Bell. Gall."); and they exhibited a general aptitude for practical avocations. On the other hand, their houses were almost as rude as those of the British Celts, being made of branches of trees and clay, and thatched with straw. (Vitruv. i. 1); their political organization was lamentably weak; their religion was the same gloomy superstition which prevailed in Britain ("Bell. Gall." vi. 13,14). They even looked to Britain as their original instructress in religion, and sent their youths there to be taught the deeper mysteries of the Druidic cult.

CHAPTER IX.

RESULTS OF THE INQUIRY.

General agreement in a modern chronology, except in the single case of Egypt—Extraordinary contrast—Question, one to be decided by evidence—Overwhelming evidence needed to establish *very* improbable conclusions—Extreme improbability of Egypt having been the only civilized country for two thousand years—Consideration of the evidence—Defects of the monumental evidence—Contradictions—Incompleteness—Admissions made by Brugsch—Evidence of Manetho—Doubt whether he is correctly reported—Reasons why little reliance is to be placed on his numbers (*a*) as reported; (*b*) as originally set forth—Mistakes of Manetho—Absurdity of his general scheme—Recapitulation of conclusions—Their harmony with the chronology of the Septuagint—Tabular view of the chief conclusions arrived at.

THE general result of the inquiry wherein we have been engaged, would seem to be that, so far as civilization can be traced back historically, there is one country, and one country only, where the critical judgment of the present day is still in suspense, and some difficulty exists in reconciling the conclusions of historical and archæological science with those moderate notions of the date whereto the past history of our race extends, which till lately were almost universally held, and which are still generally maintained in educational text-books. Exaggerated chronologies are common to a large number of

nations; but critical examination has (at any rate in all cases but one) demonstrated their fallacy; and the many myriads of years postulated for their past civilization and history by the Babylonians and Assyrians, the Hindoos, the Chinese, and others, have been shown to be pure fiction, utterly unworthy of belief, and not even requiring any very elaborate refutation. Cuneiform scholars confidently place the beginnings of Babylon about B.C. 2300,* of Assyria, about B.C. 1500.† The best Aryan scholars place the dawn of Iranic civilization about B.C. 1500,‡ of Indic about B.C. 1200.§ Chinese investigators can find nothing solid or substantial in the past of the "Celestials" earlier than B.C. 781, or at the furthest B.C. 1154.‖ For Phœnicia the date assigned by the latest English investigator is "the sixteenth or seventeenth century before Christ."¶ The researches of Dr. Schliemann in the Troad give indications of the existence of a low type of civilization in that region, which may reach back to about B.C. 2000.**

* Lenormant, "Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol.ii. p. 22; G. Smith, "Notes on the Early History of Assyria and Babylonia," London, 1872, etc.

† Lenormant, "Manuel," vol. ii. p. 55; Sayce in "Records of the Past," vol. iii. p. 29, note 1.

‡ Haug, "Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees," p. 225.

§ Max Müller, "Ancient Sanskrit Literature," p. 572.

‖ See an article by Dr. Edkins in the October number of the "Leisure Hour" (1876), p. 653.

¶ Kenrick, "Phœnicia," p. 340.

** Assuming that the rule of accumulation on the site of Hissarlik prior to the building of the Greek Ilium, about B.C. 700, was

In the rest of Asia Minor we have no certain knowledge of any civilization that has a greater antiquity than about B.C. 900.* In Europe, the simple and incipient civilization delineated by Homer must have existed before his time, and may have commenced as early as the Trojan epoch, which is probably about B.C. 1300—1200. No other European civilization can compete with this, the Etruscan not reaching back further than about B.C. 650 or 700,† and the Celtic, such as it was, being really subsequent to the occupation of England by the Romans.‡ A *consensus* of *savants* and scholars almost unparalleled limits the past history of civilized man to a date removed from our own time by less than 4,400 years, *excepting in a single instance.* There remains one country, one civilization, with respect to which the learned are at variance, there being writers of high repute who place the dawn of Egyptian civilization about B.C. 2700, or only four centuries before that of Babylon, while there are others who postulate for it an antiquity exceeding this *by above two thousand four hundred years!*

It is well remarked by Professor Owen, in an able paper, "On the Antiquity of Egyptian Civiliza-

tolerably uniform, and taking B.C. 1250 as the most probable date for the capture of Troy by the Greeks, we are brought to a time a little anterior to B.C. 2000, or the first deposit of human remains upon the native rock. The uniformity, however, of the rate of accumulation is uncertain.

* See above, ch. v.

† *Supra*, page 112.

‡ See the preceding chapter.

tion,"* that "the value to be assigned to discrepant conclusions on a matter of scientific research, must rest on the evidence with which such conclusions may be severally supported." Most certainly, no one would desire the decision to be made on any other grounds than these. The whole question is one of evidence, and to that point we shall presently proceed to address ourselves; but there is one preliminary consideration to which we think it right to call the attention of our readers.

The same amount of evidence is not sufficient to establish all conclusions. Very slight and weak testimony is enough for reasonable men, if the point to be established is intrinsically probable. Much higher and stronger testimony is necessary, if it is improbable. If it is very highly improbable, reasonable men will hesitate to accept the conclusion unless the evidence for it be well-nigh overwhelming.

Now, in the present case, the conclusion sought to be established by the advocates of the "long chronology" is, we venture to say, *very highly* improbable. It is no less than to suppose one section of mankind to have stood for above two thousand years on a totally different level from all other sections. It is to suppose settled government, law, order, high morality, art, science of a certain kind, to have existed for two thousand years in a single locality without spreading to other nations, without being imitated, without communicating itself; and this,

* "Leisure Hour" for May, 1876, page 324. This paper is reprinted in an appendix at the end of this work.

not in a sequestered island, not in a remote corner of the earth, but in a veritable "highway of nations," in a land which has always been a passage territory between east and west, between north and south, which stands in the closest connection with the fairest portions of the eastern world, and (as has often been said) "belongs to Asia rather than to Africa." What was the rest of mankind doing while Egypt stood at this proud eminence? Why did they make no similar advance anywhere else? How came they, all of them, to rest content with their knives of flint and chert, their stone hammers and adzes, their ornaments of bone and shell, their huts of reeds and clay, or at best of sun-dried bricks? Did they know nothing of Egypt during these twenty or five-and-twenty centuries? or did they look on without envy at the happy country in their midst, and make no effort to be like her? To us nothing seems more unlikely, more inconceivable than two millenniums of high Egyptian civilization, including art, science, good government, a fair system of morality, and an elaborate social order, while all the rest of the world was sunk in darkness, had no history, no settled government, and only the first germs of art and manufacture.

What, then, is the evidence upon which we are asked to accept this conclusion? A vague idea is afloat that the long Egyptian chronology is borne out by the Egyptian monuments; and even Professor Owen speaks of the "expanded ideas of time," which he entertains, as "deductions from lately-

discovered inscriptions,"* as if the inscriptions were really the source from which the long chronology proceeds. But it cannot be too often repeated that this is not the fact. Nothing is more certain, nothing is more universally admitted by Egyptologers, than the absence from the monuments of any continuous chronology.† For the latter portion of the history, the Apis *stelæ*, found by M. Mariette in the Serapeum,‡ which give the age of each bull at his demise, and the regnal year of the king or kings coincident with the bull's birth and death, furnish valuable chronological materials; but even these are incomplete, and for the earlier periods they fail entirely. All that the monuments supply for the time anterior to the eighteenth dynasty, consists of lists of kings,§ unaccompanied, for the most part,

* "Leisure Hour," May, 1876, page 326.

† Stuart Poole says, "The evidence of the monuments with regard to the chronology is neither full nor explicit." ("Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 506); Bunsen, "History is not to be elicited from the monuments; not even its framework, chronology" ("Egypt's Place," vol. i. p. 32); Brugsch, "It is not till the commencement of the twenty-sixth dynasty that the chronology is founded upon dates which are not much wanting in exactness" ("Histoire d'Egypte," 2me ed. p. 25); Mariette and Lenormant, "The greatest obstacle to the establishment of a regular Egyptian chronology is the circumstance that the Egyptians themselves never had any chronology at all" ("Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne," vol. i. p. 332).

‡ See his work, "Renseignements sur les soixante-quatre Apis trouvés au Sérapéum," Paris, 1855.

§ There are five such lists. One is that of the Papyrus Roll, at present in the Turin Museum, and known as the "Turin Papyrus," which was edited by Sir Gardner Wilkinson as early as 1840; another, in stone, brought from the great Temple of Karnak, may

by chronological data,* and all of them more or less imperfect.† These lists, moreover, were in no case compiled earlier than the time of the eighteenth dynasty, and they are thus but very slight evidence, even of the existence of the more ancient monarchs named in them. Moreover, they differ one from another very considerably, both in the names and in the number of the monarchs whom they place on record, and it is only by an arbitrary preference of one of them to the rest, or by a still more arbitrary amalgamation, that a continuous list of the kings composing the dynasties can be made out. The monuments for the most part determine nothing as to the length of a king's reign; they show some of the kings to have reigned conjointly,‡ but do not

be seen in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris; a third, also in stone, and known as the "Table of Abydos," is in the Egyptian collection of the British Museum; a fourth, known as the "Table of Sakkarah," forms a portion of the Khedive's collection at Cairo; the fifth, which has been called the "New Table of Abydos," is, I believe, still attached to the walls of the temple in which M. Marette discovered it.

* The Turin Papyrus is the only one of the five lists which contains any numbers. It is thought to have given, in its original condition, the length of each king's reign; but the numbers are for the most part indecipherable.

† The Turin Papyrus consists of 164 fragments, and in some dynasties more than half the names are obliterated. The Karnak list contained sixty-one names only; of these twelve are lost, and the original list itself is regarded as a mere selection. The "Old Table of Abydos" has lost twenty out of the fifty names inscribed on it; the "New Table" is in better condition, but still is imperfect, and makes the eighteenth dynasty follow immediately upon the twelfth. The "Table of Sakkarah" has only fifty-eight kings, and, like that of Karnak, is regarded as a selection.

‡ See Brugsch, "Histoire d'Egypt," p. 83.

tell us to what extent this practice prevailed; and they leave wholly undetermined the question as to the extent to which kings of contemporary dynasties have been admitted into the lists.

The result, so far as the monuments are concerned, may best be stated in the words of Brugsch:* "The difficulties in the way of determining the epochs of Egyptian history, instead of diminishing, increase from day to day. . . Perhaps, if the Turin Papyrus had been preserved to our times intact, we should have been able to establish the ancient chronology of Egypt. But at the present day no living man is capable of overcoming the difficulties which prevent the reconstruction of the canon. We lack the elements necessary for completing the gaps, and supplementing the historical remains, more especially of the earlier dynasties, these remains being too few and far between to be made use of with any success. Moreover, it is certain that the lists of kings which have come down to us have been *cooked* to suit particular views."

The long Egyptian chronology has not, then, resulted from the monuments, and cannot base itself upon them. It has arisen, as Dr. Brugsch observes,† entirely from the trust placed in the

* See Brugsch, "Histoire d'Egypte," pp. 27, 28.

† Brugsch, having noted the remarkable diversity of views among the *savants* of Germany with respect to the commencement of monarchy in Egypt—a diversity (as he observes) of above 2,000 years—appends the remark, "Les calculs en question sont basés

statements of the Egyptian priest Manetho, or rather in those reports of his statements which have reached our time. According to these, the priest of Sebennytus, writing about B.C. 250, claimed for the precedent Egyptian monarchy an antiquity of between five thousand and six thousand years.*

Two questions here arise—1. Is Manetho correctly reported? and, 2. Are we bound to accept his statements as certainly true? In a former chapter it has been argued that there is a reasonable doubt whether the Egyptian priest really intended his thirty dynasties of kings, the sum of whose joint reigns amounted to above 5,000 years, to be regarded as consecutive, and in no case contemporary.† Only one modern *savant*‡ takes the view that they were really all consecutive. All the rest admit the principle of contemporaneity, and only differ with regard to the extent to which it prevailed. The "long chronology" depends on denying contemporaneity, or reducing it to a minimum. If it is the fact that five or six of Manetho's dynasties were at times contemporary,§ his numbers might be correct, and yet the 5,000 years might have to be reduced to 2,000.

But can his numbers be considered correct? In the first place, there are three versions of them, no

sur les chiffers contenus dans les extraits de l'ouvrage du prêtre Manéthon sur l'histoire de l'Egypte" ("Histoire," p. 24).

* See above, p. 23.

† Ibid. note.

‡ M. Mariette

§ As held by Wilkinson, Stuart Poole and even Bunsen.

one of which has more external authority than the other two. In the second, where the monuments furnish any evidence at all, they contradict him frequently and vitally. Manetho gave to the three Pyramid kings reigns of sixty-three, sixty-six, and sixty-three—in all 192—years, or only eight years short of two centuries. The Turin Papyrus replaces these numbers by six, six, and twenty-four—in all thirty-six years, or less than one-fifth of Manetho's total.* Manetho gave to the predecessor of the second Menkeres a reign of forty-four years; the Turin Papyrus cuts the number down to eleven years. † Manetho assigned to the first Sesostris (of the twelfth dynasty) a reign of forty-eight years; the monuments give him, at the utmost, nineteen years. ‡ Similar discrepancies occur in scores of cases, and the result is greatly to discredit Manetho's numbers as they have come down to us. As Brugsch observes: "Les chiffres de Manethon sont dans un état déplorable;" and there exists no means of rectifying them. §

Supposing, however, that we could recover the original Manetho, should we be bound to accept him as an authority from whom there could be no appeal?

* See Brugsch, "Histoire d'Egypte," p. 48.

† Ibid. p. 50.

‡ Ibid. p. 83. Manetho is not always so greatly in excess with respect to his numbers; but on the whole he raises considerably the years of the kings' reigns, as given in the Turin Papyrus. That document favours the view that the average reign of an Egyptian monarch did not much exceed fifteen years.

§ "Histoire d'Egypte," p. 25.

Surely not. Manetho wrote about B.C. 280—250, or about 1,200 years after the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, about B.C. 1500. He professed to carry back the history of Egypt for some thousand or thousands of years before this. But what materials could he have for his history? Probably he had the same monumental lists which we possess, and others similar to them. He may have had access to the Turin Papyrus in its unmutilated state; he may have been able to refer to other documents of the same age. But there is no reason to think that he possessed contemporary memorials of the Middle or Old Empire, or knew anything more of them than the traditions which the monarchs of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties committed to writing, after a "shipwreck" of Egyptian civilization,* in which all was lost. He could, it would seem, only have *guessed* the duration of the Shepherd dominion. The duration of the previous native empire must have been still more obscure. The Egyptians, when left to themselves, had "never had a chronology;"† and documents like the Turin Papyrus, containing bare lists of kings with regnal years attached, could be of little value, except as showing what the monarchs of the nineteenth dynasty believed, or wished to be believed, as to the

* Lenormant, "Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol. i. p. 360: "Nous assistons donc, sous la quinzième et seizième dynastie à un nouveau *naufrage* de la civilization Egyptienne."

† Ibid. p. 322: "Les Egyptiens eux-mêmes n'ont jamais eu de chronologie."

past of their country. Extant contemporary monuments might present in certain instances the names of the kings, but would be unlikely to show either which kings of a dynasty ruled conjointly, or which dynasties were contemporaneous. Copious remains, and a careful study of them, would have been needed to determine such points as these. The "shipwreck of civilization" immediately preceding the eighteenth dynasty caused the remains to be scanty; the intense egotism of the monarchs would be unfavourable to anything like careful study of remote history.

Again, Manetho certainly failed to present a true version of the chronology subsequent to the eighteenth dynasty. Here Herodotus is sometimes more to be depended on than he.* But if the priest of Sebennytus could be mistaken in respect of this (comparatively speaking) recent period, is it not likely that he committed still greater errors with regard to times very much more remote?

Let it be further noted that Manetho's scheme of thirty dynasties of Egyptian kings, beginning with Menes, with reigns of which the sum amounted to between 5,000 and 6000 years, was a part of a far larger scheme of mundane chronology which no

* For instance, Herodotus gives Neco a reign of sixteen years, Manetho one of six years only; but one of the Apis stelæ mentions Neco's sixteenth year. Again, Herodotus assigned to the Ethiopian dynasty, which Manetho makes his twenty-fifth, a period of fifty years. Manetho gave it forty (or forty-four) years. Mariette and Lenormant, presumably following the monuments, give to the dynasty a term of fifty years.

one thinks of accepting*—a scheme whereby the beginnings of Egyptian history were carried back to a date *more than thirty thousand years* anterior to the Christian era! All moderns agree that the greater portion of Manetho's chronological scheme is untrustworthy; the dispute is only as to the point at which we may begin to place any reliance upon it.

Upon the whole, we see no reason to retract the views which we have already expressed on the subject of Egyptian chronology, which are briefly these:—1. That the eighteenth (native) dynasty commenced about B.C. 1,500;† 2. That the Hyksos, or Shepherd period of foreign domination lasted, at the utmost, about two centuries and a half;‡ commencing not earlier than B.C. 1750; and 3. That the native dynasties anterior to the Hyksos domination,

* Manetho's scheme was as follows:

Dynasties of Egypt.

	Years.
1. Reigns of the Gods	13,900
2. Reigns of heroes	1,255
3. Reigns of other kings	1,817
4. Reigns of 30 Memphite kings .	1,790
5. Reigns of 10 Thinite kings . .	350
6. Reigns of Manes and heroes . .	5,813
7. Reigns of the 30 dynasties . .	5,000 (perhaps 5,075).
Total . . .	29,925 (perhaps 30,000).

† B.C. 1520 (Wilkinson); B.C. 1525 (Stuart Poole); B.C. 1600 (Birch).

‡ See the arguments of Canon Cooke in the "Speaker's Commentary," vol. i. p. 447.

many of which were contemporary, may have covered a space of 500, 600, or 700 years, thus reaching back to B.C. 2250, or possibly to B.C. 2450. In this way Babylon and Egypt would be, in their origin as kingdoms, about contemporary; the Pyramids would have an antiquity of about 4,000 years; civilization would have taken its rise in Egypt in the course of the third millennium B.C., and would have rapidly advanced in certain directions, as it also did in Babylon,* while in others the progress made was small;† the early civilizations of Phœnicia and Asia Minor would have followed on those of Egypt and Babylon, at no great interval; civilization would from the first have shown its tendency to spread and communicate itself; the earth would at no time have presented the spectacle of one highly-civilized community standing alone for thousands of years in the midst of races rude and unpolished; the progressive movement of civilization would have been upon the whole equable, uniform, and, if we may use the term, natural.

Such are the chronological views which profane history, monumental and other, studied by itself, seems to us on the whole to favor. We should maintain them had the Bible never been written, or had it been entirely devoid of all chronological

* See above, p. 41.

† When Professor Owen says that the Sphinx of the Pyramids is a "sculpture of exquisite art and finish" ("Leisure Hour" for May, 1876, p. 324), and the statue of Chephren one "that will bear comparison with that of Watt, by Chantrey, in Westminster Abbey" (ibid. p. 325), I can only profoundly disagree with him.

notices.* But we think it right to call the attention of our readers, whom we presume to be believers in revelation, to the fact that these views, while irreconcilable with the wholly unauthorized chronology of Archbishop Usher, harmonize admirably with the Biblical numbers, as they are given in the version called the Septuagint.

We subjoin a tabular view of the chief chronological conclusions at which we have arrived in the course of this inquiry:—

	B.C. about
Date of the Deluge, according to the Septuagint . . .	3,200
Rise of Monarchy in Egypt . . . . . (probably)	2,450
" in Babylon . . . . . (probably)	2,300
Earliest traces of civilization in Asia Minor (probably)	2,000
Rise of Phœnicia	1,550
" Assyria	1,500
Earliest Iranic civilization (Zendavesta)	1,500
" Indic " (Vedas)	1,200
" Hellenic " (Homer)	1,200
Phrygian and Lydian civilization commence	900
Etruscan civilization commences	650
Lycian " "	600

* Professor Owen seems to imagine that the curtailment of Manetho's numbers is a device of "Biblical critics," bent on forcing his chronology into an agreement with that of Scripture. But the curtailment began with the heathen writers, Erathosthenes and Apollodorus, who lived under the Ptolemies in the third and second centuries before Christ.

PART II.

ETHNIC AFFINITIES IN THE ANCIENT WORLD,

OR,

TOLDOTH BENI-NOAH.

A COMMENTARY ON THE TENTH CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

GOMER
MAGOG
TIRAS
TIBARENI
MESHECH
TUBAL
ASHKENAZ
TOGARMAH
MADAI
ELISHA
RODANIM
TARSHISH
KITTIM
LUD
ASSHUR
ARAM
ELAM
SIDON
PHILISTIM
CANAAN
NIMROD
LEBABIM
NAPHTUHIM
EBER
MIZRAIM
CAPHTORIM
PATHRUSIM
HUZ
DEDAN
SABTECHAH?
LUDIM?
PHUT
SHEBA
JOKTAN
HAVILAH
HAZARMAVETH
SABTAH
SEBA
SHEMETH
ZAL
OPHIR
ETHNOLOGICAL MAP
to Illustrate the
TENTH CHAPTER OF GENESIS
Descendents of Shem.
" Ham.
" Japhet.
5
10
15
20
25
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
Longitude East 35 of Greenwich

PART II.—ON ETHNIC AFFINITIES.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHIEF JAPHETIC RACES.

The genealogies of Scripture generally regarded as uninteresting—Their real importance—Special interest of those in the 10th chapter of Genesis—The names in the lists ethnic rather than personal—The chapter an "ethnographical essay"—Descendants of Japheth: GOMER, or the Kimmerians (Cymry); MAGOG, or the Scythians; MADAI, or the Medes; JAVAN, or the Greeks (Ionians); MESHECH and TUBAL, or the Moschi and Tibareni; TIRAS, or the Thracians—Summary—Comparison of these statements with the views of modern ethnologists—Identity of the Mosaic names with the chief divisions of the Indo-European race.

FEW things are less interesting to the ordinary reader than the Scriptural genealogies. In reading them even the humblest disciple is tempted to question whether "*all* Scripture is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, or for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. iii. 16), or whether there is not some portion of the Word which is unprofitable. Before the New Lectionary was introduced, it was not unusual for clergymen, when the second lesson was Luke iii., to conclude their read-

ing with verse 23. Yet not only are the genealogies of great importance historically, as marking strongly the vital truth, that the entire framework and narrative of Scripture is in every case real, not ideal; plain and simple matter of fact, not fanciful allegory evolved out of the author's consciousness; but often these portions of Scripture, dry and forbidding as is their first aspect, will well repay a careful and scholarly study. They are like an arid range of bare and stony mountains, which, when minutely examined, reveals to the investigator mines of emerald or diamond. Only let Faith and Patience make the search; and let the searcher bear in mind that, where all is dark to him, it may be reserved for future inquirers to let in upon the darkness a flood of light; and let him be careful not to dwarf down the majesty of God's truth to the puny standard of his own imperfect knowledge, which to the wise of another generation may seem but a sort of learned ignorance.

It is proposed, in the present and some following chapters, to draw attention to the earliest of the postdiluvian genealogies—those contained in the tenth chapter of the Book of Genesis. It is believed that they belong, very decidedly, to the class of genealogical documents deserving study; that they contain within them, concealed beneath the surface, a very considerable amount of important historical and ethnological truth.

The time is gone by when nothing more was seen in the list of names to be found in this chapter than

a set of personal appellations, the proper names of individuals. No one can read with any attention the following passage, even in its English dress without perceiving that the writer is bent rather on considering the connection of races than the descent of persons. "And Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth, *and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite:* and afterward were the *families of the Canaanites* spread abroad" (verses 15—18). The Hebrew scholar sees the same, long before he comes to this passage; for he notes that the forms of the names are in many instances plural (Madai, Kittim, Dodanim or Rodanim, Ludim, Anamim, etc.), while in one remarkable instance he comes upon a dual form, which he at once recognizes as that of a country or people. "Mizraim" (verse 6) is the word elsewhere throughout Scripture uniformly translated "Egypt." It signifies in fact "the two Egypts"—the "upper" and the "lower"—the two countries whose character is physically so different that they have always been recognized as separate; whence the monumental Egyptian kings wear upon their heads *two* crowns, and the hieroglyph for Egypt in the ancient writing is a double water-plant or a double clod of earth, representative of the two regions, the long narrow valley and the broad delta.

Again, it is worthy of notice that the majority of the names in the chapter, if they occur elsewhere in

the Bible, occur in an ethnic or else in a geographic sense. Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, Togarmah, Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, (=Chittim), Cush, Phut, Canaan, Sheba, Dedan, Elam, Asshur, Lud, Aram, Uz, Ophir, Havilah, are all of them in every other place either countries or nations. We hear of "Gomer and all his bands" (Ezek. xxxviii. 6), of "the land of Magog" (ib. verse 2), of "the isles of Elishah" (Ezek. xxvii. 7), the "men of Dedan" (ib. verse 15), the "ships of Tarshish" (1 Kings xxii. 48), and the like. Asshur is usually translated in our version by "Assyria," Elam by "Persia," Madai by "the Medes" or "Media," Cush by "Ethiopia," Lud by "Lydia," Aram by "Syria." There is not one of the names above quoted that can even be imagined to be personal in any other place of Scripture, unless it be Canaan, which might have a personal meaning in Gen. ix. 18—27.

It may therefore be assumed, both from the cast of the passage itself, and from the light thrown on it by the rest of Scripture, that the object of the author of the tenth chapter of Genesis was to give us, not a personal genealogy, but a sketch of the interconnection of races. Shem, Ham, and Japheth are no doubt persons, the actual sons of the patriarch Noah; but it may be doubted whether there is another name in the series which is other than ethnic. The document is in fact the earliest ethnographical essay that has come down to our times. It is a summary, like those which may be

found in Bunsen's "Philosophy of History" or Max Müller's "Survey of Languages," arranging the chief known nations of the earth into an ethnographic scheme. In examining it, we must remember that it is three thousand years old, and that it was written by a Jew and for the Jews. We must therefore only look to find in it an account of the nations with which the Jews, at the date of its composition, had some acquaintance.

The genealogy opens with the statement that "the sons," or descendants, "of Japheth were Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras" (verse 2). Can we identify the races intended under these various names, all or any of them?

Gomer.—Scripture tells us nothing further of Gomer, excepting that his armed "bands" should take part in an invasion of Judæa which was impending at the time when the prophet Ezekiel wrote his thirty-eighth chapter, which was probably about B.C. 600. They were to come in company with those of Magog, Meshech, Tubal, and Togarmah, "from the north quarter" (Ezek. xxxviii. 2—6), and were to join in producing a great desolation, but were soon afterwards to suffer a reverse. Gomer, therefore, should be a warlike people, not averse to taking part in the raids of other nations, dwelling somewhere in the north country, or in the regions between Syria on the one hand and the Black Sea and Caucasus on the other, and powerful in these parts towards the close of the seventh century before

our era. Now these requirements are all met by a race which the Assyrians called Gimiri, or Kimiri, and the Greeks Kimmerii, who warred in north-west Asia from about B.C. 670 to 570,* and who, according to Strabo,† occasionally ravaged Asia Minor in conjunction with a Thracian people called Treres. The Kimmerii dwelt originally in the broad plains of Southern Russia, the tract known as the Ukraine, but being dispossessed by the Scythians, they fled (or a portion of them fled) across the Caucasus into Armenia and Asia Minor. They there ravaged and plundered far and wide for about a century, warring with Gyges and Ardys, the Lydian kings, burning the temple of Diana at Ephesus‡ overrunning Phrygia,§ and even penetrating into the remote and mountainous Cilicia, through the passes of Taurus.‖ They have been probably identified with the Cimbri of Roman times, a portion of the great Celtic race, some of whose tribes were found in Britain when the Romans conquered it, and came to be called by them Cambri, and their country Cambria. The descendants of these Cambri still hold a portion of our country, and know themselves by their old name of Cymry, utterly ignoring the name, which we English give them, of "Welsh."

* See Herodotus, i. 15, 16, 103; iv. 11; and compare G. Smith's "History of Assurbanipal," pp. 65, 67, 72, 74, etc.

† Strab. i. p. 90.

‡ Hesych. in voc. Αὐγδαμις; Eustath. Comment. ad. Hom. Od. xi. 14.

§ Eustath. ad. Hom. Od. l.s.c.; Euseb. Chron. Can. ii. p. 324.

‖ Callim. Hymn. ad Dian. 248–260.

Others of the same stock maintained themselves for some centuries in the north, and gave to the mountainous district that harboured them the appellation, which it still retains, of *Cumberland*. We may say therefore, that Gomer probably represents the Celtic race under one of their best known and most widely extended names, and that the author of Genesis meant to include among the descendants of Japheth the great and powerful nation of the Celts.

MAGOG.—Of Magog, or Gog (for the names seem to designate the same people*), nothing can be concluded from the word itself. There is no recognized ethnic appellative with any pretension to importance that bears any near resemblance to either of the two terms. It appears, however, from Ezekiel (xxxviii. and xxxix.) that the race which these terms, as used by the Jews, designated, was one of remarkable power towards the close of the seventh century B.C.—that it led the expeditions in which Gomer participated, and pushed them as far as Palestine—that it dwelt, like Gomer, in the "north country"—that its weapon was the bow (Ezek. xxxix. 3)—and that its warriors were all horsemen (Ezek. xxxviii. 15). These notes of character *probably* identify the people intended with the European Scythians, who were the dominant race in the tract between the Caucasus and Mesopotamia for the space of nearly thirty years,† from about B.C. 630 to B.C. 600; who invaded Palestine and besieged

* See Rev. xx. 8. "Ma" is thought to signify "land."

† Herod. i. 106, 130, etc.

Ascalon in the reign of the Egyptian king, Psammetichus,* who fought almost wholly on horseback, and were famous for their skill with the bow. *Probably*, therefore, the author of Genesis meant to include the Scyths of Europe, the conquerors of the Kimmerians, among the races whose descent he traced to the youngest of the sons of Noah.

MADAI.—With respect to the third name, Madai, there is no room for doubt. Except in this, and the corresponding passage of Chronicles (1 Chron. i. 5), the term, Madai, uniformly means—and is indeed translated uniformly, in the authorized and all other versions—"the Medes." The Medes called themselves—or, at any rate, the Persians, their near kindred, called them †—"*Madâ*," of which *Madai* is the natural Hebrew representative. There cannot be the shadow of a doubt, that, in placing "Madai" among the descendants of Japheth, the author of Genesis x. intended to notify that from that patriarch sprang the great and powerful nation of the Medes.

JAVAN.—Here again the word itself is a sufficient index to the writer's meaning. Javan is the nearest possible expression in Hebrew of the Greek term which we render by "Ionians," the original form of which in Greek was *Iafon-es*. Why and how is uncertain; but the fact is indisputable, that the Orientals used this term, universally, as the generic

* Herod. i. 105.

† See the "Behistun Inscription," col. i. par. 11 § 7; and *passim*.

name for the Greek race. The Assyrians called the Greeks of Cyprus the *Yavnan;* the Persians called those of Asia Minor and the Ægean islands, the *Yuna.* The terms "Greek," "Hellene," "Achæan," "Dorian," were unknown in Asia, or at any rate unused by the Asiatics generally, being superseded by the name "Ionian," with which alone they were familiar.

TUBAL and MESHECH, constantly coupled together in Scripture (Ezek. xxvii. 13; xxxii. 26; xxxviii. 2, 3; xxxix. 1), seem to represent the two kindred races of the Tibareni and the Moschi, who dwelt in close proximity to each other on the northern coast of Asia Minor, in the days of Herodotus and Xenophon, and who at an earlier period were among the most powerful of the races inhabiting the interior. The Assyrian monarchs were for several centuries—from about B.C. 1100 to 700—engaged in frequent wars with the *Muskai* and *Tuplai,* who then held the more eastern portion of the Taurus range, and the tract beyond it, known later as Cappadocia.* Here was the great Moschian capital, which even the Romans knew as Cæsarea *Mazaca.*† The author of the Noachide genealogy, in all probability, intends to state that the two powerful races of the Moschi and the Tibareni were, like the Kimmerians, the Scyths

* See the author's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. ii. pp. 312, 372, 421, etc.

† On the connection of the word "Mazaca" with "Meshech," see Josephus, "Ant. Jud." i. 6, § 1.

of Europe, the Medes, and the Greeks, of Japhetic origin.

Tiras.—This is the most obscure of all the names in the Japhetic list, since no other passage of Scripture throws the least light upon it. Jewish tradition, however, asserts that the Thracians are the people intended.* Etymologically, this is not perhaps altogether satisfactory, since the third root consonant of Thrace and Thracian (*Θρήϊκη*, *Θρῆιξ*=*Θρῆικς*) is not *s*, but *k*.† Geographically, however, the identification is suitable enough; and it may therefore be accepted, at any rate, till some more plausible explanation is offered. Thracian tribes occupied the greater portion of northern and central Asia Minor from a remote antiquity. The Thynians and Bithynians were always admitted to be Thracians.‡ So were the Mariandynians, according to Strabo,§ and, according to others, the Paphlagonians. A strong Thracian character belonged to the Phrygians and Mysians, whose very names were, moreover, mere variants of those borne by purely Thracian tribes, viz., the Briges and Mæsi. Thus the more ancient Hebrews might well include under the name of Thracians the chief tribes of Asia Minor, the tribes which immediately adjoined upon the Moschi towards the west, just as Tiras immediately follows

* See Josephus, "Ant. Jud." i. 6, § 1.

‡ The *k* of *Θρήκη*, *Θρῆξ* passes into *ss* in the feminine form—*Θρῆσσα* or *Θρᾷσσα*.

‡ Herod. i. 28; vii. 75; Xen. Anab. v. 10, § 17; etc.

§ Strab. vii. p. 427.

on Meshech in the genealogy. And the author of Genesis x. may be understood to include among the descendants of Japheth the whole vast nation of the Thracians, which extended from the Halys, in Asia Minor, to the Drave and Save in Europe.

Such are the conclusions to which the critical student naturally comes, when he examines the list of names in Gen. x. 2, in the light thrown on them by other passages of Scripture, by the context, and by a comparison of the words used with known ancient ethnic titles. In brief, the statement of the verse is, that a special connection of races united together the following peoples—the Cymry or Celts, the Scyths of Europe, the Medes or Aryans, the Greeks, the Thracians, and the comparatively insignificant tribes of the Moschi and Tibareni—that, in fact, these several races belonged to one stock, had one blood, were but the different branches of a single family.

Now, here is a statement which may at any rate be compared with the results of modern ethnographical research. It is the object of ethnography, or ethnology, whichever we like to call it, to trace out, as far as the facts of history, of physiology, and of language permit, the interconnection of nations. Nations which are really one family should have a family likeness; tribes which grew up together must have once had a common language. If the Celts, the European Scyths, the Medes or Aryans, the Greeks and Romans (for these two cannot be separated), and the Thracians had a common

descent, the fact should appear in a resemblance between their languages, and in a certain unity of physical type.

What then has ethnographical science, following a strictly inductive method and wholly freed from all shackles of authority, concluded on the matter before us? A single passage from the greatest of modorn ethnologists will suffice to show.

"There was a time," says Professor Max Müller, "when the ancestors of the Celts, the Germans, the Slaves, the Greeks and Italians, the Persians and Hindoos, were living together beneath the same roof, separate from the Semitic and Turanian races." * And again, "There is not an English jury now-a-days, which, after examining the hoary documents of language, would reject the claim of a common descent and a legitimate relationship between Hindoo, Greek, and Teuton."† Ethnological science, we see, regards it as morally certain, as proved beyond all reasonable doubt, that the chief races of modern Europe, the Celts, the Germans, the Græco-Italians and the Slaves, had a common origin with the principal race of Western Asia, the Indo-Persian.

Now, this result of advanced modern inductive science, a result which it is one of the proudest boasts of the nineteenth century to have arrived at, is almost exactly that which Moses, writing fifteen hundred years before the Christian era, laid down dogmatically as simple historical fact. For his

* "Languages of the Seat of War," p. 30.

† Ibid.

"Gomer," as already shown, represents certainly the race of the Celts, his "Javan" stands, beyond a doubt, for the Græco-Italians, and his "Madai" (Medes), for the Aryans or Indo-Persians, while his "Magog" may well stand for the Slaves, and his "Tiras" for the Teutons, or Germans. But these two last points require, perhaps, a few words of proof.

That the European Scyths, who overran Western Asia in the seventh century B.C., were a branch of the Indo-Germanic family, has been abundantly proved by Grimm in his "History of the German Language," published in 1848. Their kinship with the modern Slaves is implied in the statement of Herodotus (iv. 110—117), that they were closely allied in race to the Sauromatæ or Sarmatians, whose identity with the Slaves is maintained by Niebuhr and Böckh.* This statement has, indeed, been called in question; and it must certainly be admitted that the remains of the ancient Scythic language which have come down to us, though Indo-European, are not specially Slavonic. But, nevertheless, the statement of Herodotus remains—the authority of the writer is great—and the fact stated has never been disproved. At any rate, if the "Magog" of Moses does not exactly represent the nation of the Slaves, it probably includes them, for the Sarmatians, through whose country the route of the Scythians lay, no

* Niebuhr, "Vorträge über Alte Geschichte," vol. i. p. 194; Böckh, "Corp. Inscript. Gr." Introduct. ad Inscript. Sarmat. pars. xi. p. 83.

doubt joined in their invasion, and the so-called Scythic hordes which held Western Asia for thirty years, are almost sure to have been, at any rate in part, Slavonic.

That the Thracians were Teutons is not, perhaps, susceptible of proof; but it is the belief of many of the best ethnologists, and many arguments may be adduced in favour of it. The Thracian tribe of the Getæ seems to have grown into the great nation of the Goths, while the Daci (or Dacini) seem to have been the ancestors of the Danes. The few Thracian words which have come down to us are decidedly Teutonic, such as *bria*, "town" (comp. Germ. *burg*, Engl. *borough*); *brig*, "free" (comp. Gothic *freis*, Germ. *frei*). There is also a resemblance between the Thracian customs, as described by Herodotus (v. 4—8), and those which Tacitus assigns to the Germans.

To return—and at the same time, to conclude the present chapter—whereas modern ethnological science, basing itself on the facts of language, lays it down as a grand discovery that one of the great families into which the human race is divided comprises the five divisions of 1. Indo-Persians or Aryans; 2. Celts; 3. Teutons; 4. Græco-Italians; and 5. Slaves —Moses, anticipating this discovery by a space of above three thousand years, gives as members of one family—1. Madai, the Medes or Aryans; 2. Gomer, the Cymry or Celts; 3. Tiras, the Thracians (Teutons); 4. Javan, the Ionians (Greeks); and 5. Magog, the Scythians and Sarmatians (Slaves). The

only difference between the two schemes is that Moses adds further a sixth race, Tubal, the Tibareni; and a seventh, Meshech, the Moschi,—races which rapidly declined in power between B.C. 1100 and 400, and which perished without leaving either a literature or descendants, * whence modern ethnological science takes no notice of them.

* Some have found in the Moschi the founders of Moscow, and the ancestors of the present Muscovites. But this identification has no historical or ethnological basis, resting wholly on the similarity of the names.

CHAPTER II.

SUBDIVISIONS OF THE JAPHETIC RACES, GOMER AND JAVAN.

Comparative obscurity of the minor details in the Mosaic genealogies—Subdivisions of Gomer and Javan—1. Of Gomer, three: ASHKENAZ, an unknown race; RIPHATH, also unknown; TOGARMAH, or "people of Armenia"—2. Of Javan, four: ELISHAH, or Æolian Greeks; TARSHISH, or people of Tarsus in Cilicia; KITTIM, or Greeks of Cyprus; RODANIM, or Rhodians—Impossibility of determining why two only of the Japhetic races are subdivided—Importance of the principle of subdivision—Geographic position of the Japhetic races.

THE grand outlines of the Mosaic ethnology are not hard to read; but in the details there is, not unfrequently, very considerable obscurity. The names here belong often to the class of those which occur in no other independent passage of Scripture; and in some instances the real original form of the name is doubtful. But, though these circumstances render interpretation difficult, and in some degree uncertain, they do not altogether preclude it. As the wanderer who passes through an unknown tract of country when the evening twilight is settling down upon it, while he sees but dimly, still sees to some extent, and acquires a certain amount of knowledge regarding the district which he traverses, so the student of these darker passages of the

Sacred Text may gather something of their meaning from careful examination of them, albeit he is fain to acknowledge that in many respects he may have failed to grasp their true sense, and that even where he may have seized it, he has done so by conjecture, rather than by any process that admits of being clearly traced out and stated.

With these preliminary remarks, we proceed to examine the second step in the Mosaic account of the affiliation of nations. "And the sons of Gomer; Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah. And the sons of Javan; Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim."—(Gen. x. 3, 4.)

ASHKENAZ.—The Ashkenaz must in the time of Jeremiah have been located in the Armenian highland, or at any rate in its immediate vicinity, since they are joined by him with Minni and Ararat (li. 27). They were to accompany Cyrus to the siege of Babylon, which took place in B.C. 538. As neither Scripture nor profane history makes any other mention of any such people in these parts, I should incline to suppose them to be an obscure Cymric tribe, which, like Tubal and Meshech, decayed and came to nothing soon after the time of Jeremiah. It is possible, though far from certain, that we have traces of their name in the lakes,*

* Two lakes in Asia Minor bore anciently the name of Ascanius. One was in the eastern part of Bithynia, near Nicæa (Strab. vii. p. 389). It is now the Lake of Iznik. The other lay towards the south, in Southern Phrygia, or Pisidia (Arrian, "Exp. Alex." i. 29; Herod. vii. 30). It is salt, and is known as Lake Chardak.

and river, *Ascanius* in Asia Minor, and also in *Scandia* and *Scandinavia;* but if so, we must regard those names as given by an early population which had disappeared before our first historical knowledge of the tracts in question.

RIPHATH.—This name is doubtful, for the reading of the Hebrew text in the parallel passage of Chronicles (1 Chr. i. 6) is Diphath, and neither name occurs in any other passage of Scripture. The Hebrew *r* and *d* are so similar in shape that they were constantly confused by the copyists; and, where one has replaced the other in a proper name, it is seldom possible to decide which was the original form of the word. Here, indeed, as the Septuagint translators read "Riphath" in both passages, we may perhaps assume that as most probably the true form. Of the Riphath, however, as a people, we know nothing;* and we must be content to allow that the Mosaic record is here again—as in the preceding case—incapable of comparison with the results of modern ethnology, since we do not know what race is intended.

TOGARMAH.—The people thus designated are mentioned twice by Ezekiel (xxvii. 14, and xxxviii. 6); in the former passage as trading in the fairs of Tyre with horses and mules, in the latter as about to come with Gomer out of the north quarter

* It has been proposed to connect Riphath with the Rhipæan Hills of Ptolemy, Damastes, and others, which some identify with the Carpathians (Knobel, "Völker-tafel der Genesis," p. 44). But the name Rhipæan (derived from ῥιπή, "a blast") is not ethnic.

against Palestine. Neither passage does much towards fixing a locality, but both agree with the hypothesis, which has the support alike of etymology and of national tradition, that the people intended are the ancient inhabitants of Armenia. Grimm's view * that Togarmah is composed of two elements, *toka*, which in Sanskrit is "tribe," or "race," and *Armah* (Armenia), may well be accepted; and the Armenian tradition † which derived the Haïkian race from Thorgau, as it can scarcely be a coincidence, must be regarded as having considerable value. Now, the existing Armenians, the legitimate descendants of those who occupied the country in the time of Ezekiel, speak a language which modern ethnologists pronounce to be decidedly Indo-European; and thus, so far, the modern science confirms the Scriptural account. It has not, however, as yet been shown that there is any special connection between Armenian and Celtic, which is what the mention of Togarmah among the sons of Gomer would lead us to expect. Perhaps further study of the Armenian language, especially in the more ancient of its extant forms, as in the "history" of Moses of Chorêné, may reveal such a connection. Perhaps the connection may have existed without its being possible now to prove it. So many races from very ancient times found a refuge in the Armenian fastnesses, that we can well understand the original ethnic character of the true

* See his "Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache," vol. ii. p. 825.

† Mos. Chor. "Hist. Armen." i. 4, § 9.

Armenians having been submerged and lost before the rise of a literature, or at any rate of that literature which has come down to us.

ELISHAH.—Some have recognized in this name the Greek word Hellas, which, from about the date of the Persian war, was used to express the aggregate of the Greek race. But it is better, with Josephus, to explain the term as equivalent to *Αἰολεῖς*, Æolians. The Æolians were one of the principal Grecian tribes: and though not Ionians according to Greek ideas, were yet closely akin to them, and are properly enumerated among the "sons" of Javan, when that term is used, as it is throughout the Old Testament, for the Greek people *generally*. The passage of Ezekiel, in which alone the word recurs, confirms the notion that the Æolians are intended (Ezek. xxvii. 7). It speaks of them as inhabiting the "islands" or maritime districts, which the tribe especially affected, and as supplying the Tyrians with the famous purple dye (*murex*), which was abundant on many of the coasts where the Æolians were settled.*

TARSHISH.—Tarshish here can scarcely designate the remote Tartessus, which was probably not founded till after Moses's time, and with which the Jews seem first to have become acquainted in the reign of Solomon. It represents more probably Tarsus in Cilicia, which, though said by some to have been

* See Virg. "Georg." i. 207; Athenæus, "Deipnosoph." iii. p. 88; etc.

founded by Sennacherib,* is not unlikely to have been an old settlement in which that monarch placed a body of new colonists. Tarsus was close to Kittim (Cyprus), with which this passage immediately connects it. We are, indeed, nowhere told that it was peopled by Greeks till after the time of Alexander; but there is reason to believe that there were Hellenes settled on the Cilician coast from a very remote date, as there certainly were in Cyprus. According to Abydenus,† Sennacherib's colonization of Cilicia was resisted by certain Greeks, who engaged his fleet unsuccessfully, which they would scarcely have done unless they had considered Cilicia to belong, at least in part, to them. We may therefore regard Tarshish here as representing the people of Cilicia, or rather the Greek element in the population of that country, which may perhaps have been considerable.

Kittim.—There can be little doubt that Kittim, or Chittim (as it is sometimes spelt in our version), was understood by the Hebrews to designate in an especial way the people dwelling in Cyprus. The ancient capital of that island was called by the Greeks "Kition," and its inhabitants were known as "Kitieis," or "Kittiæans." In course of time, the word no doubt came to have a larger sense, being extended from Cyprus to the other islands of the Ægean, and from them to the mainland of Greece,

* Polyhistor. ap. Euseb. "Chron. Can." i. 5; Abydenus ap. Eund. i. 9.

† Euseb. "Chron. Can." i. 8.

and even to Italy. But at the early date to which this genealogy belongs the word "Kittim" must almost certainly have been used in its primitive acceptation of "the Cypriots." Now it is generally stated by historians and ethnologists that the original population of Cyprus was Phœnician, and that the Greek element which holds a position of pre-eminence in the island during the historical times was imported into it at a comparatively late date, consisting of emigrants from European Hellas.* But all this is very uncertain. When Cyprus first comes before us in history, it is *predominantly* a Greek island. The Assyrians knew it, about B.C. 710, as "the land of the *Yavnan* or *Yunan*," *i.e.*, of the Ionians or Greeks. There is no trustworthy evidence of the time at which the Greek part of the population first settled in the island, nor any satisfactory proof that they were immigrants from Europe. They may have been, at least in part, primitive settlers. The Greeks of Europe, who regarded themselves as the product of their own soil (*αὐτόχθονες*, *γηγενεῖς*), and supposed that all other Greeks elsewhere must of necessity have sprung from them, dated the foundation of Greek colonies in Cyprus from the time of the Trojan war, or about B.C. 1250, according to the earlier chronologists. We may conclude from this that all which the European Greeks really knew was that there had been persons of their race and name in Cyprus from the earliest times whereof they had anything like actual

* Marm. Par. 26; Theopomp. Fr. 111; Clearch. Solens. Fr. 25; Strab. xiv. p. 971; etc

knowledge. There were no real relations of mother-country and colony between any Cyprian town and any state of European Greece. If the stream of migration originally flowed into Greece Proper from Asia, it would be likely that some portions of the race would be left behind on the road. Of these primitive Asiatic Greeks, who were not colonists, and had not come from Europe, there are traces in various places, as in Magnesia under Sipylus, which was Greek, but anterior to the Ionian colonization, and in the town of the same name on the Mæander. May not the Greeks of Cyprus have been another such body of laggarts—a waif and stray from the main migration,* which pressed on from Asia into Europe?

Dodanim or Rodanim.—Here again the manuscripts vary. While the bulk of them have Dodanim in Genesis, almost all have Rodanim in the corresponding passage of Chronicles (1 Chr. i. 7). The Septuagint translators, however, in *both* places give *Rhodii* (*Ῥόδιοι*); and the Samaritan version, the next in antiquity to the Greek, agrees with it. Rodanim, therefore, may be assumed to be the true reading; more especially, as it was an unfamiliar word, about which a copyist might doubt, whereas Dodanim (דדנים), a mere plural form of the well-known Dedan

* Recent discoveries with respect to the Cypriot language strongly confirm this view. It is essentially Greek, both in grammar and vocabulary; but it differs very widely from any form of the Hellenic with which we were previously acquainted, and has all the appearance of having split off from the common stock at a very remote era. (See the "Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology," vol. i. pp. 153–172; vol. v. pp. 88–96.)

(דדן), would have in it nothing strange or provocative of doubt. But if this view is accepted, and the word is read as Rodanim, there can scarcely be a question that the Septuagint translators have given us the true clue to the meaning. By "*Rhodii*" they certainly meant the "Rhodians," or inhabitants of Rhodes, the other great littoral island of Western Asia, which would naturally occur to the thoughts of a writer who had just spoken of Cyprus. Now there is abundant evidence that the inhabitants of Rhodes were Greeks from an exceedingly early time. The very name of the island—the only name which it can be proved to have ever historically borne—is a word of Greek etymology which none but a Greek race would have given it. It is formed from the word *rhodon* (ῥόδον), "a rose," and Rhodes (Ῥόδος) is "the Isle of Roses." Hence this flower was stamped upon the coins. Homer represents Rhodes as Greek before the time of the Trojan war; * and indeed we have no indication of any other race than the Greek having ever had a hold upon the island. Rhodes too was in early times a colonizing, and so a famous power—one, therefore, of which some knowledge might naturally have reached the writer of the Pentateuch.

What, then, has been the object of the writer in the two verses which we are considering? He has selected two out of the seven races, which he had previously declared to have descended from Japheth, and he has subdivided them; or rather, he has

* Hom. Il. ii. 667.

particularized certain nations, known to himself and to those for whom he immediately wrote, as belonging to the races in question. Why he has taken two only of the races, and omitted the other five, we cannot say. Perhaps he was not acquainted with the ramifications of the others; or perhaps he regarded them as sufficiently well known to his readers. It is seldom possible to give a perfectly satisfactory account of a writer's omissions; more especially an ancient writer's; so many motives cause them, and so difficult is it for any one at the present day to throw himself back into the exact position and attitude of one who wrote in primitive times.

Leaving aside, therefore, the question of what the writer has not told us, let us consider what it is which he has designed to teach in these two verses. First, then, *he has indicated the principle of ethnic subdivision.* He has noticed the fact that races, as they increase, subdivide; and thus, that, as mankind spread over the earth, there was a constant breaking up into a larger, and still a larger, number of nations. These nations were distinct, not merely politically, but linguistically, and so ethnically; for "by these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands, *every one after his tongue*" (verse 5). The author has thus prepared us for the fact of great multiplicity in language, a fact with which each year's experience makes us more and more largely acquainted; and at the same time he has prepared us for the far more curious and far less obvious fact, of the resemblance and connection between what appear at first sight to

be completely distinct tongues. The science of ethnology has found it necessary to speak of "mother," "sister," and "daughter" dialects. Genesis x. tells us of "mother," "sister," and "daughter" races. The harmony is evident. Indeed it may be confidently stated that the gradual division of parent races into diverse tribes, and the further subdivision of these tribes into distinct ethnic units, is the only theory of ethnology, which at once harmonizes with, *and accounts for*, the facts of language, as comparative philology reveals them to us. And this theory is that of Genesis x.

Further, the writer here informs us, that there were within his knowledge three nations of Cymric and four of Greek origin. The Cymric races he plants in the highlands of Armenia, in the vicinity, at any rate, of the tract which was the great early home of the Cymric race in the times known to us through profane history. The Greek races he places in Cyprus, in Cilicia, in Rhodes, and in the adjacent coasts and islands, all which are either known to have been, or may reasonably be suspected to have been, at a very early date, peopled by Greeks. In neither case does he assert, nor are we to suppose, that the division which he makes is scientific or exhaustive. The author nowhere professes to give a division which is to particularize all the nations living upon the earth in his day. He singles out under each head certain races which were known to him and to his readers. These are, naturally enough, those of countries not far removed from Egypt and

Palestine. The geographic limits of the Japhetic stem, as exhibited to us in verses 2—5, do not go beyond the Peloponnese towards the west, the coast of the Black Sea towards the north, and the Caspian towards the east. We may well imagine that geographic knowledge did not extend further in Moses's time. Within the limits which we have indicated, all the chief Japhetic races seem to be mentioned. The Æoïes in the Peloponnese and the adjacent regions, the Thracians north and east of these, in Europe and in Asia Minor, the Cymry on the northern shores of the Euxine, the Scythians in the tract between the Euxine and the Caspian, the Moschi and Tibareni in Cappadocia and Colchis, Cymric tribes in Armenia, the Medes in Azerbijan and Northern Persia, Rhodian Greeks in Rhodes, Cypriot Greeks in Cyprus, and Cilician Greeks in Cilicia, fairly cover the ground, and show no remarkable omission. The general teaching is, that the nations to the north and west of Mesopotamia and Syria were Japhetic, and that within the geographic limits known to the writer they comprised seven principal races. Modern ethnological science in no ways conflicts with either of these statements. On the contrary, so far as it is able to pronounce an opinion, it endorses the statements made, finding the facts of the case, so far as it is able to get hold of them, always consistent with, and sometimes very strikingly illustrative of, the Mosaic narrative.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHIEF HAMITIC RACES.

Races descended from Ham: Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan—Cush represents the Ethiopians—Mizraim, the people of Egypt—Phut, probably the "Pet" of the hieroglyphical inscriptions, a people of Nubia—Canaan, the ancient people of Syria and Palestine—Geographical proximity of these races—Modern ethnology undecided in its view of them—Mixed character of the Egyptian language—Language of the Ethiopians only to be guessed from that of the purer tribes of Abyssinians—The Canaanites generally regarded as Semitic—Grounds of this belief examined—Nothing really known of the Canaanite language—General conclusions negative rather than positive.

"AND the sons of Ham; Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan" (Gen. x. 6). It is thus that the ancient genealogist, after enumerating the chief races descended from Japheth, proceeds with his ethnological table. From Ham, the second of the sons of Noah, were descended, according to him, four main races, which he designates respectively as "Cush," "Mizraim," "Phut," and "Canaan." Let us see if we can identify, either certainly or probably, the races intended.

Cush.—The word "Cush" is, in the authorized version, for the most part translated by "Ethiopia."

In this rendering our translators followed the old Latin version known as "the Vulgate," which here accords with the Septuagint. Now, Ethiopia, which is a Greek word, adopted by the Romans, designates (according to Greek and Roman notions) *especially* the country lying immediately to the south of Egypt, the modern Abyssinia; and the Ethiopians are, *especially*, the people of this country, the progenitors of most of the modern Abyssinians. And, undoubtedly, this tract and people were included under the term "Cush" by the Hebrews, as is evident from Ezek. xxix. 10 (compare 2 Chron. xiv. 9; xvi. 8; 2 Kings xix. 9; Isa. xx. 3—5; Dan. xi. 43; and Nahum iii. 9). But there are passages which show that the Hebrew application of the term, both geographically and ethnically, was considerably wider than this. The paradisaical "Cush," which was watered by the river Gihon (Gen. ii. 13), must have been in Asia, not in Africa. An Asiatic "Cush" is often indicated in Scripture, as where Ezekiel joins Cush with Persia (Ezek. xxxvii. 5), and where Isaiah couples it with Elam (xi. 11). This Asiatic Cush, apparently, embraces parts of Arabia (Gen. x. 7; Isa. xliii. 3; xlv. 14); of Mesopotamia (Gen. x. 8—10), and of the region still further to the eastward (Ezek. xxxviii. 5; Isa. xi. 11). The writer of the genealogy, therefore, probably intends to state, that the primitive inhabitants of these various tracts, the Ethiopians proper above Egypt, a portion of the Arabians, the primitive Babylonians, and their neighbours to the eastward,

the Cissians, were among the descendants of Noah's second son, the patriarch Ham.

MIZRAIM.—It has been already observed in an earlier chapter (see page 167), that this word is a dual in form, and that it is the word which occurs in the original (with scarcely an exception) wherever we in our version have "Egypt." It has been conjectured that the true original reading in this place was "Mizrim"—"the Egyptians"—which is possible, though uncertain, and not of much importance. What is clear, is, that the writer intended to state that the Egyptians, of whom he was about to tell us so much in his histories of Abraham, Joseph, and Moses, were, like the Cushites or Ethiopians, descendants of Ham, sprung from the same source with the inhabitants of the Upper Nile valley, with whom they were in their after history so intimately connected. It is quite clear that this descent of the Egyptians from Ham was generally believed by the Jews, who called Egypt "the land of Ham" (Psa. cv. 23, 27; comp. lxxviii. 51), in distinct allusions to the patriarch. Whether the Egyptians themselves were aware of the descent is doubtful. They called their country *Khem*, or *Khemi*, which closely resembles "Ham;" but perhaps the resemblance of the two names is accidental, Egypt being called *Khem*, "black," simply to mark the colour of its soil.

PHUT—This term is somewhat obscure. The only passages of Scripture which throw any further light upon it are, Jer. xlvi. 9; Ezek. xxvii. 10;

xxx. 5; and xxxviii. 5; Nahum iii. 9; and, perhaps, Isa. lxvi. 9. In most of these places Phut is joined with tribes which are distinctly African; but in two of them (Ezek. xxvii. 10, and xxxviii. 5), the accompanying nations seem to be Asiatic. The explanation of this may possibly be, that, as there were two Cushes, so there were two Phuts, one Asiatic and the other African—the African Phut being the original nation, while the Asiatic was an offshoot thrown out from it. But it is also possible that, in the two cases where Phut occurs in an Asiatic connection, the connection may be no sure sign of geographical proximity. In Ezek. xxvii. 10, all that is said is, that Tyre hired her mercenary troops from Persia, Lud, and Phut; and in Ezek. xxxviii., where Persia, Cush, and Phut are said to have served in the army of Gog, mercenaries may again be intended. Thus it is doubtful whether there is really any Asiatic Phut in Scripture; and our attention may be confined to the question of what nation is intended by the African Phut. Now here we may note, in the first place, that the nation appears to be one dwelling in immediate proximity to Egypt and Ethiopia, to one or other of which it is closely attached in every passage; and, secondly, that it is one of those who serve in the Egyptian armies (Jer. xlvi. 9; Nahum iii. 9) with shield and bow.* If we now inquire from our Egyptian

* The use of the bow by the Phut was probably noticed by Isaiah in ch. lxvi. 19; where the present Hebrew MSS. have פּוּל *i.e.* Pul. Pul occurs as an ethnic title nowhere else in Scrip-

sources of information, what nation answers to this description, we find a people called by the Egyptians PET,* whose emblem was the unstrung bow, and who dwelt between Egypt and Ethiopia proper, in the region now called Nubia. Over this tract the Egyptian kings claimed dominion, and its people would no doubt serve in their armies. Their special weapon was, as we may conclude from their emblem, the bow; and there is thus little doubt that they are the people called "Phut" (or "Put," Nahum iii. 9), by the Hebrews.

CANAAN.—There is no doubt at all with respect to the people which this term represents. They were the ancient inhabitants of Palestine and Lower Syria, the people who possessed the entire tract between the Mediterranean and the desert, from Hamath in the north to Gaza in the south, before Abraham with his Syrian colony entered the country. The land of Canaan, mentioned in the early Egyptian inscriptions no less than in Scripture,† derived its name from them. They yielded gradually to the encroachments of the Hebrews upon the south, and to those of the Assyrians and other Semitic nations to the north, and finally died out and disappeared, much as

ture, whereas Phut or Put is common. Put (פּוּט) was the reading of the Greek translators (LXX.), who render by *Φούδ*. And Phut is in three other passages connected with Lud—Jer. xlvi. 9; Ezek. xxvii. 10; xxx. 5.

* See Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. ii. pp. 868, 869; and compare "Records of the Past," vol. ii. p. 32; vol. iv. p. 15; vol. vi. p. 26; etc.

† See "Records of the Past," vol. ii. p. 51; vol. vi. p. 34; etc.

the Celtic population disappeared from our own country. During their most flourishing period they comprised six principal tribes—the Hittites, Hivites, Amorites, Jebusites, Perizzites, and Girgashites—besides many smaller ramifications.

Thus the four main races which, according to the sacred genealogist, derived their origin from the patriarch Ham, may be identified, either certainly or very probably, with the Ethiopians (Asiatic and African), the Egyptians, the *Pet*, or ancient Nubians, and the people of Canaan. As he had assigned to the descendants of Japheth a particular geographical quarter and direction—the northern and the north-western portions of the world, as it was known to him—so he now assigns to the progeny of Ham a continuous region or tract, which lies wholly towards the south. Canaan, Egypt, Nubia, and Ethiopia—taken in its widest use—are in a certain sense conterminous, and form the southern boundary of the world as known to the Hebrews. They stretch from the Mediterranean on the west, to the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean towards the east, comprising not merely Palestine and the Nile valley, but Southern Arabia, Babylonia, and Kissia.

If it be asked now, what view does modern ethnology take of the relation borne to each other by the races to which the sacred genealogist thus assigns a common origin, the answer must be that, in this case, modern ethnology speaks with stammering lips, ambiguously and hesitatingly. "Philologers are not agreed as to an Hamitic class of languages." So little

is known, in fact, of any of these languages but the Egyptian, that the question has scarcely presented itself as yet to philologists generally as a problem to be solved—Was there in the ancient world an Hamitic, as there was certainly a Semitic and a Japhetic group of languages? Still, there are some inquirers who have turned their attention to this particular point; and the result of their investigations appears to be, on the whole, confirmatory of the Mosaic statement which we are here considering.*

The language of the ancient Egyptians is tolerably well known to us from the remains of it existing on the monuments and in papyri, which it has been found possible to interpret by the help of the modern Coptic, and of the clue furnished by the Rosetta stone. Although in some respects it presents resemblances to the class of tongues known as Semitic, yet, in its main characteristics, it stands separate and apart, being simpler and ruder than any known form of Semite speech, and having analogies which connect it on the one hand with Chinese, and on the other with the dialects of Central Africa. It is not a typical specimen of an Hamitic tongue, since it presents the appearance of a language in which a native groundwork has been largely overlaid by a foreign accretion. But in its non-Semitic element

* See especially the articles on CANAAN, CUSH, HAM, MIZRAIM, and PHUT in Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," contributed by one of our best Egyptian scholars, Mr. Reginald Stuart Poole.

it furnishes a clue to the character of the ancient Hamitic tongue, and helps us to pronounce on the Hamitic or non-Hamitic character of other more imperfectly known forms of speech.

The language of the ancient Ethiopians proper—those who dwelt on the Blue Nile, in the tract south and south-east of Egypt—has perished entirely. The nation had, in the early times, no literature; and we should have possessed no clue to their tongue, were it not that we are able to examine the dialects of their descendants, who have continued ever since to occupy the same country, and have never wholly changed their speech. The Abyssinian tribes of the Agau, Galla, Gonga, and others, appear to be the legitimate descendants of the old Ethiopic population; and their languages, which are decidedly non-Semitic, present numerous analogies to the non-Semitic portion of the ancient Egyptian.

According to the notion which has found general favour with ethnologists, the language of the Canaanites was Semitic. This is assumed mainly from a supposed identity of the Canaanites with the Phœnicians, who were certainly of the Semitic family. But recently a good deal of evidence has been brought forward to show that the Phœnicians and the Canaanites were really just as distinct as the English and the Britons, or the French (Franks) and the Gauls, the real connection being simply that the one people succeeded the other in the same country. The Canaanites were the original inhabitants of Palestine and Lower Syria; and among their towns

were Sidon, Arca, Arvad, and Zemara, or Simyra,* all of which afterwards became Phœnician. The Phœnicians were, according to the most ancient accounts,† immigrants into Syria from the shores of the Persian Gulf, at a date to which their national traditions extended. It would seem that they expelled the Canaanites from the coast tract, and took possession of their towns, the names of which they retained, while they built also a number of new cities. Their ethnic character was very different from that of the Canaanites. The latter were "fierce and intractable warriors, rejoicing in their prancing steeds and chariots of iron, neither given to commerce, nor to any of the arts of peace." The former were "quiet and peaceable, a nation of traffickers, skilful in navigation and in the arts both useful and ornamental, unwarlike except at sea, and wholly devoted to commerce and manufactures."‡ Again, "Whereas, between the Canaanites and the Jews there was deadly and perpetual hostility, until the accursed race was utterly rooted out and destroyed, the Jews and Phœnicians were on terms of almost perpetual amity—an amity encouraged by the best princes,"§ who would scarcely have contracted alliance with a people under the wrath of God.

* The Zemarites of Gen. x. 18 are the inhabitants of a town which is mentioned both in the hieroglyphic and in the cuneiform inscriptions under the name of Zimira ("Ancient Monarchies," vol. i. p. 410), or Simyra ("Records of the Past," vol. ii. p. 22).

† Herod. i. 1; vii. 89; Justin, xviii. 3, § ii. etc.

‡ See the author's "Herodotus," vol. iv. p. 198, second edition.

§ Ibid.

But if this presumed identity be set aside, there is nothing that can be urged in favour of the Semitic character of the Canaanites, excepting the derivations of a certain number of (presumed) Canaanite names. Melchizedek, Hamor, Sisera, Salem, Ephrath, and many others of the most ancient names of persons and places in Palestine, have plausible Hebrew derivations, which are thought to show that the language of the country, in the time anterior to the Phœnician occupation, was already of the Semitic type. But it should be remembered that these names came to us *solely through the Hebrews;* and that all nations—the Orientals especially—are apt to deflect foreign names from their native form, and to put them into a shape which assimilates them to their own speech. If the name of Alexander had come to us only through the Oriental form of Iskander, or Scander, we might have thought that the nation to which he belonged was Semitic, or Turanian; we should certainly never have suspected it to be Greek. So with such words as Bokht-i-nazar for Nebuchadnezzar, Stamboul for Constantinople, Roum for Roma, Eregli for Heracleia, Negropont for Euripus,—we could not possibly have deduced aright the ethnic character of the people by whom the names were originally given, from the travesties that have superseded them in the mouths of Turks or modern Greeks.

It would seem, therefore, that, in point of fact, we know nothing of the language spoken by the ancient Canaanites. It is unsafe to conclude anything from names which come to us only through the mouth of

a foreign people; and no other remnants of the ancient Canaanite speech remain to us. Here, then, we must be content once more to confess our ignorance, and to lay down simply the negative conclusion—that there is nothing known of the ancient Canaanites that renders it impossible, or even unlikely, that they spoke a tongue akin to that of their neighbours upon the south—the Egyptians.*

If little is known of the language of the Canaanites, still less can be laid down as to that of the Phut, or ancient people of Nubia. We can only say that, from the position of this people between Ethiopia and Egypt, it is probable that they spoke a tongue not very different from the languages of those nations. So far as we have any means of judging, the ancient races of North-eastern Africa were all connected together. Varieties of one ethnic family seem to have peopled the whole Nile valley. Physically, the various races most certainly resembled one another; witness the representations on the Egyptian monuments, and the mummies found along the whole middle course of the river. It is not likely that in language they were very different.

* One or two positive indications, favourable to the conclusion, that the tongue spoken was actually Egyptian, or Cushite, may be mentioned, In *Baalbek* we have probably the name of a very ancient Palestinian town. But this name contains the Egyptian element *bek*, "a city," and is formed on an Egyptian model (compare *Atarbechis*, Herod. ii. 41.) In *Beth-shan* (now *Beisán*), expressly called a city of the Canaanites (Judg. i. 27), we have probably a city dedicated to the sun, under the name which he bore in early (Cushite) Babylonia, which was *San*.

But in this case, as in the preceding one, modern ethnology is simply silent. The data for forming a judgment are wanting; and where this is the case, the disciple of Bacon holds his tongue. Inquiry has shown that the Egyptians and Ethiopians (Mizraim and Cush) were, as represented in the Mosaic genealogy, most certainly akin to each other. Inquiry has not yet shown anything positive with respect to the ancient Nubians (Phut), or the people of Canaan. An unproved theory with respect to the Canaanites, which it would have been difficult to reconcile with the Mosaic statements, has recently been examined with care, and shown to be groundless.* And thus the case rests, so far as Gen. x. 6 is concerned.

* See the author's essay, already referred to, in the fourth volume of his "Herodotus," pp. 196–202.

CHAPTER IV.

SUBDIVISIONS OF CUSH.

Principal Cushite races, according to Genesis—Seba, or the people of Meroe—Havilah, or the people of Khawlán, in Arabia—Sabtah, or the people of Sabota, the capital of Hadramaut—Raama, Sheba, and Dedan, or the Arab tribes of the south-east—Sabtechah, a race not identified—Geographic position of these tribes and races—Ethnological inquiry shows two races in Arabia, a Northern and a southern—The southern race, Cushite—Meaning of the phrase "Cush begat Nimrod"—Geographical position of Nimrod's kingdom—View of the late Baron Bunsen—Cushite character of the early Babylonians proved by Sir H. Rawlinson—General result.

"AND the sons of Cush; Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah, and Sabtechah: and the sons of Raamah; Sheba, and Dedan." (Gen. x. 7.) In this verse and in the next we have the descendants of Cush pointed out to us; or, in other words, we are told which were the principal races that derived their origin from the primitive Ethiopians. It would seem from the list that the Ethiopians, having settled themselves in the country south and south-east of Egypt, between the main stream of the Nile and the sea-coast, proceeded at a very early date to send out colonies, which assumed new names, from leaders, or otherwise, on quitting their original home, and carried them to the new

localities wherein they took up their abodes. We must endeavour in the present chapter to follow the line of this migration, and to identify the various races named, as a preliminary to the inquiry, What was the ethnic character of these nations? does, or does not, modern research give reason to believe that it was in early times Ethiopian or Cushite?

SEBA.—This name, which must not be confounded with Sheba, seems to have been applied in ancient times to a particular portion of the East African country, which bore the general designation of Cush or Ethiopia. Josephus says* that Saba (Σαβά) was the ancient name of the famous Ethiopian city of Meroë and of the district about it. One of the main rivers of the region was the Asta-*sobas*. In Scripture we find Seba, and the Sabæans; or more properly the Sebæans (סְבָאִים), usually connected with Ethiopia Proper and with Egypt.† The Sebæans themselves are said, in one passage, to have been "men of stature;" and Herodotus remarks that the Ethiopians of his day had the character of being the tallest and handsomest nation in the world.‡ Altogether, it seems best to regard the Seba of Gen. x. as denoting a special division of the Ethiopian people, probably the ruling race, which dwelt about Meroë (Saba), the capital, and was physically superior to the rest of the nation.

* "Ant. Jud.," ii. 10, § 12.

† See Isa. xliii. 3; xlv. 14.

‡ Herod. iii. 20, 114.

HAVILAH.—Apart from 1 Chron. i. 9, which is a mere transcript of Gen. x. 7, there are three, and three only, passages of Scripture, where this word is found. These passages are Gen. ii. 11, in the description of Eden; Gen. xxv. 18, in the account given of the country of the Ishmaelites; and 1 Sam. xv. 7, where Saul's slaughter of the Amalekites is spoken of. A careful examination of the context in each of these places has led to the conclusion that in none of them is the Havilah intended which is here mentioned. We are thus reduced to obtain our explanation of the term from two considerations only—namely, that of the name itself, and of its position in the present list. These considerations have induced the learned generally to identify the people in question with the inhabitants of the Arabian tract known as Khawlán, in the north-western portion of the Yemen.

SABTAH.—No other passage of Scripture throws any light on this name; but, if Havilah is rightly identified with Khawlán, we may connect Sabtah with the Sabbatha or Sabota of Pliny and Ptolemy, which was on the south-coast of Arabia, and was the capital of the Atramitæ, or people of Hadramaut. By this identification Sabtah forms a connecting link between Havilah on the one hand, and Raamah —which will be next discussed—on the other.

RAAMAH, SHEBA, and DEDAN.—The Cushite race called here Raamah was overlaid and eclipsed by its descendants, the most celebrated of the South Arabian tribes, Sheba and Dedan. Sheba must un-

doubtedly be connected with the great race of the Sabæans, which as early as Solomon was the chief in Arabia (1 Kings x. 10; Psa. lxxii. 10), and which is greatly celebrated by the classical writers.* The race was apparently a mixed one, being only in part descended from Ham, while in part—in great part, probably—it was composed of Semites (Gen. x. 28). Dedan is to be sought eastward of Sheba, on the shores of the Persian Gulf, where the name seems still to linger in the island of *Dadân*, on the border of the gulf. The Dedanians are mentioned by Isaiah as sending out "travelling companies," which lodged in the wilds of Arabia (xxi. 13); and Ezekiel enumerates them among the merchants who supplied Tyre with precious things (xxvii. 20.) In this last quoted passage the people of Dedan are conjoined with Sheba and Raamah (verse. 22), and also with those of Assyria and Chilmad in Babylonia (verse 23); so that the location of the Cushite Dedan, in the immediate neighbourhood of Chaldea and the Gulf would seem to be certain.

SABTECHAH.—We have no means of knowing what race is indicated by this name, or what exact locality is to be assigned to them The word occurs only here and in 1 Chron. i. 9. The connection of Sabtechah with Raamah points to a position on or near the Persian Gulf; but our data do not justify us in coming to any more exact conclusion. Some have supposed a connection between the word Sabtechah and the Samidacé of Ptolemy, which was a

* See Diod. Sic. iii. 45, 46; Strab. xvi. 4, 19; Plin. H. N. vi. 23.

city of Carmania; but the resemblance of names is too remote to entitle us to build a theory upon it.

The general conclusion to be drawn from Gen. x. 7 appears to be the following. The genealogist means to assign to the family of Cush the primitive inhabitants of almost all Southern and South-eastern Arabia. Regarding the Cushite settlements as proceeding from Ethiopia (or Abyssinia), he traces them across the Red Sea to the opposite shores of Yemen or Arabia Felix, and thence eastward, along the coast tract now known as Hadramaut, to the boarders of the Persian Gulf and the neighbourhood of Chaldea. He regards the Cushite races inhabiting this tract as principally four, which he designates under the names of Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah, and Sabtechah; the most important of the four being Raamah, under which were comprised the Cushite Sheba and Dedan.

Here we may pause to inquire if modern ethnological science has anything to say which either confirms or impugns these statements of the genealogist. Many popular writers speak in a certain vague and general way of the Arabians being Semites; and the language known as Arabic is certainly a Semitic form of speech. From these premises a conclusion is sometimes drawn, that Cushite races are out of place in the Arabian peninsula, and that here at least the genealogist is detected in a mistake. Such a conclusion might at any time have have been pronounced, at the best, precarious; since great parts of Arabia are up to the present day unexplored, and nothing at all is known of the ethnic character of

their inhabitants. But recent researches enable us to go a step further, and to lay it down that the conclusion is not only uncertain, but is at actual variance with fact. M. Antoine d'Abbadie, Dr. Beke, M. Fresnel, and others, have proved that there are to this day races in Southern Arabia, especially the Mahras, whose language is decidedly non-Semitic; and that between this language and that of the Abyssinian tribes of the Galla, Agau, and their congeners, there is a very considerable affinity. The Mahra, moreover, is proved by analysis to be the modern representative of an ancient form of speech found in inscriptions along the South Arabian coast, and known to philologists as Himyaric. These inscriptions are thought to be evidently of a high antiquity; and the Himyaric empire to which they are supposed to belong is carried back by some scholars to as high a date as B.C. 1750.* Thus it would seem to be distinctly made out that Arabia contains, and has from a very remote time contained, at least two races; one, in the northern and central regions, Semitic, speaking the tongue usually known as Arabic; and another in the more southern region, which is non-Semitic, and which from the resemblance of its language to the dialects of the aboriginals of Abyssinia, the descendants of the ancient Ethiopians, deserves to be called Ethiopian or Cushite. The Mosaic genealogist is thus in this instance strikingly confirmed by ethnological science on a point where his statements seemed most open to attack.

* Bunsen "Philosophy of History," vol. iii. p. 227, E. T.

"And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord. And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar." (Gen. x. 8—10.)

Every reader sees that here there is a change in the narrative. We have no longer a mere genealogy, but the commencement of a personal history. An individual is introduced, an individual of such distinction and eminence that his name had already, in the time of Moses, passed into a proverb—"Even as Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord." But, although the style of the narrative is changed in a way that is harsh to modern notions, the main object of the writer is still the same. He is bent on tracing the spread of the Cushite race. He has brought the race in the preceding verse from African Ethiopia, along the Southern Arabian shore to the west coast of the Persian Gulf, to the immediate vicinity of Chaldæa. He now brings them into Chaldæa and Babylonia. Nimrod, he tells us, the son of Cush, or the Cushite, who "began to be a mighty one in the earth," set up the "beginning" or "head" of his kingdom at "Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar." These names belong, one and all, to the broad tract of alluvial soil at the head of the Persian Gulf, watered by the two great streams of the Tigris and the Euphrates, known to the Greeks and Romans,

from its people, as Chaldæa, and from its capital city as Babylonia. The name "Babel" speaks for itself, and is sufficient to identify the position; which, moreover, all the other terms bear out. "Shinar" in Scripture is always the low country about Babylon. Here clay and bitumen (the "slime" of Gen. xi. 3) abounded; and here great buildings were very early raised out of these poor materials, the remains of which exist to the present day. Hither went the Jews into captivity (Zech. v. 11); and hence were they "recovered" when God set His hand the first time to draw together the remnant of His people (Isa. xi. 11). Erech, which the Septuagint translators render by Orech (*Ὀρέχ*), is beyond a doubt the city which the Greeks and Romans called Orchoë, and which is to this day known as Irka or Warka,* on the left bank of the Euphrates, about one hundred and twenty miles south-east of Babylon—a site covered with mounds and ruins, from which numerous remains of great antiquity have been recovered. "Accad" is a term found in the primitive nomenclature of the country; where it designates both a race and a city.† Finally, Calneh or Calno (Isa. x. 9) was, according to the Septuagint interpreters, in the same region, being, according to them, the exact spot "where the tower was built" (*οὗ ὁ πύργος ᾠκοδομήθη*), and consequently in the near vicinity of Babylon.

* See Loftus, "Chaldæa and Susiana," pp. 160–192.

† The city Accad was recognised by Mr. George Smith in the year 1874. (See the "Records of the Past," vol. iii. p. 4.)

The meaning then of the writer cannot be doubted. He intends to state that Nimrod and his people, the conquering race which first set up a monarchy in Lower Mesopotamia, and built or occupied the great cities of the alluvial plain, Babel or Babylon, Accad, Erech or Orchoë, and Calneh or Calno, were Cushites, a kindred race to the people of Ethiopia Proper, or the tract about the great Nile affluents, and to various tribes scattered along the south-western, southern, and eastern shores of the Arabian peninsula. What light, if any, does modern ethnology throw upon this interesting statement?

A few years back a great ethnologist made answer (practically) to the effect, that his science repudiated the statement altogether. "Nimrod," he said, "was no Cushite by blood." He and his people were pure Turanians, or Tatars. They conquered Babylonia from Africa, and so, having come from the land of Cush, were called Cushites. But the expression was purely "geographical." They were quite unconnected in race with either the Egyptians or the Ethiopians. Indeed, an Asiatic Ethiopia was a pure figment of Biblical interpreters; it "existed only in their imaginations," and was "the child of their despair."

So wrote the late Baron Bunsen in 1854.* But Sir Henry Rawlinson, the earliest decipherer of the ancient Babylonian monuments, came to a completely different conclusion in 1858. A laborious study of the primitive language of Chaldæa led him

* See his "Philosophy of Universal History," vol. iii. pp. 190, 191.

to the conviction that the dominant race in Babylonia at the earliest time to which the monuments reached back was Cushite. He found the vocabulary of the primitive race to be decidedly Cushite or Ethiopian, and he was able to interpret the inscriptions chiefly by the aid which was furnished to him from published works on the Galla (Abyssinian) and the Mahra (South Arabian) dialects. He noted, moreover, a considerable resemblance in the system of writing which the primitive race employed, and that which was established from a very remote date in Egypt. Both were pictorial; both to a certain extent symbolic; both in some instances used identically the same symbols. Again, he found words in use among the primitive Babylonians and their neighbours and kinsmen, the Susianians, which seemed to be identical with ancient Egyptian, or Ethiopic, roots. The root *hyk* or *hak*, which Manetho interprets as "king," and which is found in the well-known "*Hyk*sos," or "Shepherd-kings," appeared in Babylonian and Susianian royal names under the form of *khak*, and as the *terminal* element —which is its position also in royal Ethiopic names. The name "Tirkhak" is common to the royal lists of Susiana and Ethiopia, as that of Nimrod is to the royal lists of Babylon and Egypt. The sun-god is called "Ra" in Egyptian, and "Ra" was the Cushite name of the supreme god of the Babylonians. Many other close analogies might be mentioned; but these are probably sufficient as specimens. It is impossible within the limits of a

work such as the present, to do more than give specimens of what has been proved by a laborious induction.

The result is, that once more the modern science of ethnology, arguing wholly from the facts of language, has come to a conclusion announced more than three thousand years ago by the author of Genesis. The author of Genesis unites together as members of the same ethnic family the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, the Southern Arabians, and the primitive inhabitants of Babylon. Modern ethnology finds, in the localities indicated, a number of languages, partly ancient, partly modern, which have common characteristics, and which evidently constitute one group. Egyptian, ancient and modern, Ethiopic, as represented by the Galla, Agau, etc., southern Arabian (Himyaric and Mahra), and ancient Babylonian, are discovered to be cognate tongues, varieties of one original form of speech. Primæval history is thus confirmed most signally by modern research; and the *Toldoth Beni Noah* is once more proved to be, what it has been called—"the most authentic record we possess for the affiliation of races."*

* "As. Soc. Journal, vol. xv. p. 230.

CHAPTER V.

SUBDIVISIONS OF MIZRAIM AND CANAAN.

Races of Egyptian descent—Ludim, an unknown people—Anamim, also unknown—Lehabim, or Libyans—Naphtuhim, or Na-Petu—Pathrusim, or people of the Phaturite nome—Casluhim, an unknown people—Philistim, the Philistines—Caphtorim, the people of Coptos—Nothing known ethnologically of the Na-Petu—Probable resemblance of the Philistines to the Egyptians—Grounds for regarding the Libyans as "cognate" to the Egyptians—Descendants of Canaan—Supposed Semitic character of some disproved.

"AND Mizraim begat Ludim, and Anamim, and Lehabim, and Naphtuhim, and Pathrusim, and Casluhim (out of whom came Philistim), and Caphtorim." (Gen. x. 13, 14.)

Having concluded his account of the descendants of Cush, whom he has represented as the eldest of the "sons of Ham" (ver. 6), the genealogist returns to Mizraim, the second "son," or (in modern phraseology) the second great race descended from the patriarch Ham. As offshoots of this race,—the Egyptian,—he proceeds to enumerate eight tribes or nations,—the Ludim, the Anamim, the Lehabim, the Naphtuhim, the Pathrusim, the Casluhim, the Philistim, and the Caphtorim. It will be our first task in the present chapter to endeavour to identify these various races.

LUDIM.—Similarity of sound has tempted commentators to connect with this name the well-known race of the Lydians, the chief people of Western Asia Minor, from whose historical or mythological stores the Greeks drew the romantic tales of Cambles the glutton, of Candaules and Gyges, of Crœsus, Atys, and Adrastus, the Phrygian,—tales told so inimitably by the ancient writers, that the best modern version is but a feeble echo of them. But the general duty of resisting temptation is nowhere more imperative than in the field of comparative philology, in which the identifications that have the most enticing appearance are almost in every instance mere traps to catch the unwary. In the case before us, if we examine the Scripture records, we shall find that the Hamitic Ludim, who are frequently mentioned, are plainly an African, and not an Asiatic people; and therefore that their identity with the Lydians is quite out of the question. They are commonly united with either Cush or Phut, or both (Isa. lxvi. 19; Jer. xlvi. 9; Ezek. xxx. 5), and are spoken of as a principal element of the strength of Egypt, as serving in her armies, and participating in her destruction. We must consequently regard them as a people who in later times were dependent on the Egyptians, and who dwelt near them,—probably in the vicinity of Phut, which has been shown to be the modern Nubia (p. 194). Further than this nothing can be laid down with certainty, neither the classical writers nor the Egyptian monuments furnishing us with any name in this

locality which can reasonably be compared with Ludim.

ANAMIM.—Here conjecture is still more at fault. The Anamim are mentioned only here and in the parallel passage of Chronicles (1 Chron. i. 11). We have thus no clue to their locality beyond what the context of the present passage furnishes; * and this context cannot be said to tell us more than that they were an East African people, probably one at an early date absorbed into either Ethiopia or Egypt.

LEHABIM.—Once more we touch sure ground. The Lehabim (לְהָבִים) seem to be rightly identified with the Lubim (לוּבִים), who appear frequently in Scripture as near neighbours of the Egyptians, and who are beyond a doubt identical with the *Rebu* or *Lebu* of the monuments and with the "Libyans" (Λίβυες, *Libyi*) of the Greeks and Romans. This people inhabited the tract which bordered Egypt upon the west, extending to some distance along the northern coast. They were generally dependent upon Egypt, and served in large numbers in the Egyptian armies (2 Chron. xii. 3; xvi. 8; Nah. iii. 9). The Greeks came in contact with them when they occupied the Cyrenaica, and from them called the entire southern continent by the name of Libya. Their descendants are probably to be found in the modern Tuariks and Berbers, aboriginal races of

* The hieroglyphic inscriptions mention a people called "Anu" (Brugsch, "Histoire d'Egypte," première livraison, p. 103): but this name is not very close to Anam.

North Africa, inhabiting the desert and the flanks of Atlas.

NAPHTUHIM.—Like Anamim, this name occurs only in the Hamitic genealogy, and it is therefore extremely difficult to lay down anything positive with regard to it. If, however, we may judge by its position in the list, it should designate a people dwelling west of the Nile, either in Egypt or immediately upon its borders. Exactly in this position occurs the geographic name *Niphaiat*, applied in Coptic to the country about the Mareotic Lake, at the north-west corner of the Egyptian territory. In the Egyptian monuments no such geographic name is found; but we read of a people called the *Na-Petu*, whose position is uncertain. It is conjectured that the Naphtuhim are this race; * and that in the time of Moses they dwelt on the western border of Egypt, perhaps in the Mareotic nome, to which their name still attaches.

PATHRUSIM.—Pathros, the local name, from which the gentilitial noun "Pathrusim" is formed, occurs frequently in the writings of the Jewish prophets, where it designates, apparently, a district of Egypt—probably that in the immediate vicinity of Thebes (see Jer. xliv. 1, 15; Ezek. xxix. 14; xxx. 14). Pliny calls this region "the Phaturite nome"; † and it appears to have derived its name from a town near Thebes which the Egyptians called *Ha-Hat-her*, or, with the article, *Pha-Hat-her*, whence the

* See Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. ii. p. 465.

† See Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 9, § 47, "Nomus Phaturites."

Hebrew, "Pathros," or "Phathros." Originally, the race inhabiting this district would seem to have been considered separate and distinct from the rest of the Egyptians. At a very early date it asserted independence, and was ruled by its own kings. Later, it established a supremacy over the rest of Egypt; but at this time it had lost any distinctive character, and had become thoroughly and entirely Egyptian. The Pathrusim of the Mosaic genealogy must be regarded as the inhabitants of Upper Egypt, originally a colony or offshoot of the Mizraïtes of the lower region, but ultimately absorbed by the parent nation.

CASLUHIM.—The Casluhim are wholly unknown to us.* Their name occurs nowhere but in this passage, and in the corresponding verse of Chronicles (1 Chron. i. 12).

PHILISTIM.—According to the present passage, and the corresponding verse of Chronicles, the Philistim, or Philistines, were a branch of the obscure race of the Casluhim. According, however, to several other passages of Scripture (Deut. ii. 23; Jer. xlvii. 4; Amos ix. 7), the Philistines were not Casluhim, but Caphtorim. It is proposed,† therefore, in the present passage (and in 1 Chron. i. 11) to invert the order of the two names, and to read—"and Caphtorim (out

* The attempts to identify the Casluhim with the Colchians (Bochart, Gesenuis), and again with the inhabitants of Mount Casius (Bunsen, "Bibelwerk," p. 26), seem to us to be failures.

† Stuart Poole in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 282.

of whom came Philistim) and Casluhim." The alteration is not of very much importance, since the main point of interest is the Mizraïte (or Egyptian) origin of the Philistines, which is asserted with equal distinctness, whichever order of the words is preferred.

CAPHTORIM.—Caphtor and the Caphtorim are mentioned only in connection with the Philistines, as the country and the race which gave birth to the Philistine people. We have thus no clue to the locality here intended except the position of the name in the passage, which is doubtful, and the vague one furnished by Jeremiah's expression, אִי כַּפְתּוֹר, "the *isle* of Caphtor" (xlvii. 4). If this expression were of necessity to be taken literally, we must think of some island of the Mediterranean, as Crete or Cyprus. But the Hebrew אִי is used of shores and coasts, no less than of islands (see Gen. x. 5), and may even extend to inland tracts on the borders of a river large enough to be, like the Nile (Nah. iii. 8), regarded as a sea. Hence the identification, which has been suggested,* of Caphtor with Coptos, which the ancient Egyptians called *Kebt-hor*, and which is termed by the modern Copts *Keft*, or *Kuft*, would seem to be worthy of acceptance. The Coptic nome adjoined that of Thebes, lying a little farther to the north; and thus, if the name in the original list immediately followed that of the Pathrusim, as has been shown to be probable, it would have been in a very natural position.

The result of this examination of the Mizraïte

* Stuart Poole in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 274.

names has been a failure to identify three,—Ludim, Anamim, Casluhim,—a probable identification of two (Pathrusim, Caphtorim) with tribes ultimately absorbed into the Mizraïtes,—and an almost certain identification of the other three with nations dwelling near Egypt,—the Naphtuhim with the *Na-petu*, the Philistim with the Philistines, and the Lehabim, or Lubim, with the Libyans.

It follows to ask what modern ethnological science teaches of these three last-mentioned races. Does it teach anything at all about them; and if so, does it regard them as diverse from, or akin to the Egyptians? If the former, it opposes the Mosaic statement; if the latter, it supports it.

Now, so far as one of the three nations—the *Na-petu*—is concerned, answer there is none. This race perished, or was absorbed, at an early date, and no information is procurable as to its language, manners, or physical type; consequently, modern ethnology pronounces nothing concerning its ethnical character.

But with regard to the other two, the case is somewhat different. Something is known of the general character of the Philistine people, and we possess a certain number of Philistine names, as Achish, Goliath, Ishbi-benob, Saph, and perhaps the following list:—Salatis, Bnon, Apachnas, Apophis, Jannas, and Asses. Now of these names all that can be said is, that while none of them is Semitic in character, several have a decided resemblance to Egyptian names known to us from good sources. "Jannas," for instance, will remind

every reader of the "Jannes" who, together with Jambres, "withstood Moses" (2 Tim. iii. 8). "Saph" is like "Suphis," the builder of the great pyramid. Again, "Achish" recalls the Egyptian king "Aches," the seventh of Manetho's second dynasty; and "Apophis" may well be a Grecized form of "Pepi," corresponding to "Athothis" for "Thoth," and "Amenephthes" for "Menephthah." Further, with respect to manners and physical type, one of the best of modern Egyptologers informs us that the Philistines, as represented on the Egyptian sculptures, together with the Tokkaru and the Shayretana, "bear a greater resemblance to the Egyptians than does any other group of foreign peoples represented in their sculptures." * There would seem, then, to be sufficient ground for saying that the Philistines appear, from what we know of them, to have been cognate to the Egyptians; though no doubt they separated off from them at a remote date, "before the character and institutions of the latter had attained that development in which they continued throughout the period to which their monuments belong." †

With respect to the Libyans, whether we can form a positive judgment, or no, depends upon the view we take of the connection between them and the modern non-Arab inhabitants of North Africa. The history of the region makes it probable that these inhabitants are, in the main, the descendants

* Mr. R. Stuart Poole, in Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 275. † Ibid.

of the old Libyans. The names still borne by the tribes corroborate this view. The Libyan tribe of the *Marmaridæ* is represented by the modern *Berbers;* and that of the *Cabales* by the *Cabyles.* Numerous customs recorded by the ancients as obtaining among the ancient Libyans are found still to exist among the Berbers and Tuariks. On these grounds the best modern ethnologists regard the identity of the two races as established, and speak of the Berbers, Tuariks, Shuluhs, Cabyles, etc. as the descendants of the aboriginal population of northern Africa.* But if this be granted, then we may say that modern ethnology distinctly supports the Mosaic statement of the Mizraïte character of the Lehabim, since a very considerable analogy has been traced between the native languages of North Africa and the Egyptian and Coptic, an analogy which is more striking in the structure than in the roots, but which extends to some of the simplest and earliest words. In Berber "one" is *ouan;* in Coptic, *ouot;* in Egyptian, *oua;* in Shuluh, two is *seen;* in Coptic, *snaü;* in Coptic "to drink" is *so;* it is *soo* in Berber and Tuarik. *Ouas,* Berber for "day," resembles Coptic (or rather Sahidic) *hu; ikhf,* Berber for "head," may be traced in Egyptian *ape,* and Coptic *aphe,* which in the oasis of Ammon is *akhfe.* Tuarik *mar* for "man," is perhaps identical with Coptic and Egyptian *romi.* These and other similar resemblances are regarded as sufficient to constitute the Berber, Tuarik, etc. "cognate"

* See Prichard, "Physical History of Mankind," vol. ii. p. 25, etc.

dialects to the Egyptian;* and "cognate dialects," as already remarked more than once, are an indication of "cognate races."

"And Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth, and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite: and afterward were the families of the Canaanite spread abroad." (Verses 15—18.)

This portion of the Mosaic genealogy needs but a very few words of comment. The sacred writer, specially interested in that branch of the Hamitic family with which his countrymen were to be brought into peculiarly close and permanent connection, enters with great minuteness into its subdivisions, enumerating no fewer than eleven distinct tribes within the narrow area of the Canaanite country, which extended between Hamath and Gerar, a distance of no more than about two hundred and eighty miles. These tribes are, for the most part, excessively obscure, nothing more being known of several than their bare names; they have left no literature and no records† and the modern ethnologist has thus scarcely any means of determining their ethnic characteristics, or of testing the statement that they belonged to the family of Ham. In most instances he has but the names themselves

* See Bunsen, "Philosophy of Universal History," vol. i.

† An exception must be made with respect to the Hamathites, who have left a certain number of inscriptions, which, however, are not yet satisfactorily deciphered.

to go upon; and so unsafe is it to draw any conclusion from such meagre data, that nothing would have been said of the names in this place had not it seemed good to some etymologists to found a theory upon them. It has been argued * from supposed Semitic derivations of some of the appellations in the above list, as notably of "Sidon" and "Amorite," that the race which gave the names must have spoken a Semitic tongue, and therefore that the Canaanite tribes are wrongly placed by Moses among the Hamitic nations. The force of this argument must of course depend, in the first instance, on the probability of the supposed derivations; but, to render it of any great account, probable Semitic derivations should be given, not of one or two of the names only, but of all of them. Now this has not been attempted. Certain names have been selected out of the list, for which a plausible Semitic derivation could be alleged; and on evidence thus picked and culled the world has been asked to reject the statements of Moses.

Further, the derivations suggested are extremely unsatisfactory. Sidon, for instance, is derived from the Hebrew *tsâdoh*, and said to mean "a fishing-place," † which is thought to be an appropriate name for a seaport town. But *tsâdoh*—צָדָה—is "to hunt" rather than to "fish;" *tsayyâd* is "a hunter," and *tsaîd* "a hunting" or a "prey." The sense of

* Kenrick, "Phœnicia," p. 47, et seq.

† Ibid. Dean Stanley adopts the derivation ("Sinai and Palestine," p 270).

"fishing" may be included in *tsâdoh*, but it is certainly not the primary sense of the word. "To fish" is *dûg*—דּוּג—and the proper word for "a fishery" is *dûgâh*—דּוּגָה.

"Amorite" (אֱמֹרִי) is regarded as a mere variant of "Aremite" or "Aramæan" (אֲרַמִּי), which is probably enough derived from *rûm*—רוּם—"to be high." It is said, therefore, to be equivalent to "mountaineer" or "highlander." * But the transposition of root letters, which forms the basis of this theory, is very rare in the Semitic languages, and, in the case of names, has not been supported by any sufficient number of parallel instances. Moreover, if "Amorite" were granted to be a Semitic word, meaning "mountaineer" or anything else, it would not at once follow that the Amorite nation was Semitic. The names given to nations by their neighbours are often quite unknown to themselves, and indicate the language, not of the people designated, but of the people which gave the designation. The name "Parthian" was probably imposed on the Turanian Parthians by their Iranic neighbours; that of "Greeks" was imposed on the Hellenes by the Italians. In our own country we call a people "Welsh" (*i. e.* "strangers") whose only name for themselves is Cymry. Unless we are sure that an ethnic title is one which a race gives itself, we can draw no conclusion from its etymology; and we certainly do not know this of the title "Amorite."

* Ewald, "Geschichte des Volkes Israel," vol i. p. 315; Stanley, l.s.c.

It thus appears that the ethnic names under which the Canaanitish races are designated by the Hebrews furnish no trustworthy evidence of the Semitic origin of the people. Ethnology has, in fact, no sufficient materials on which to form a judgment in this case. Neither the names of the races, nor those of individual Canaanities (see above, p. 201) can fairly be taken to prove anything on the point in question. We must consider that in this instance ethnological science is silent, not confirming, but in no way opposing, the statements of the Biblical historian.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SEMITIC RACES.

Races descended from Shem—Why placed last—Eber, or the Hebrews—Elam, or the people of Elymaïs—Asshur, or the Assyrians—Arphaxad, supposed to be people of Arrapachitis—Lud, the Luden or Ruten of the hieroglyphics—Aram, or the Syrians—Ethnic character of the Luden and of the Elamites uncertain—Semitic character of Aramaic and Hebrew—The Assyrian language and physiognomy Semitic—Summary.

"UNTO Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even unto him were children born. The sons of Shem; Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram." (Gen. x. 21, 22.)

The writer of the genealogy, having completed his account of the races descended from Japheth and from Ham, proceeds in the last section of this chapter, which extends from verse 21 to verse 31, to mention the chief races and nations descended from the remaining patriarch, Shem. He has reserved Shem to the last, not because he was the youngest of the three brothers, for the true translation of verse 21 is—"Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the *elder brother of Japheth*, were children born," but because the subsequent narra-

tive is going to be concerned with the descendants of Shem almost exclusively, and thus by reserving Shem the narrative is made to run on more connectedly.

EBER.—He opens his account with a statement that Shem was "the father of all the children of Eber," thus at once calling attention to the fact, that the peculiar "people of God," whose history he is about to trace, were one of the tribes belonging to the Semitic family. In this he anticipates what he afterwards tells us, with much additional detail, in verses 24—30, and in ch. xi. verses 13—26. The Israelites were among the children of Eber, or Heber (עבר), and hence the name by which they were commonly known among the surrounding nations * was "Hebrews" (עברי). They were not the only race so descended, or numerically the most important one; but they were *the only race that kept the name;* and we cannot doubt that the author had them especially in his mind when he noted at the very outset of his account of Shem's descendants that they included "all the children of Eber."

But the actual "sons" of Shem, or main divisions of the Semitic race, according to our author, were the following:—ELAM, ASSHUR, ARPHAXAD, LUD, and ARAM. We have, in the first place, to identify these races.

ELAM.—We have frequent mention of Elam both

* "Hebrew" seems to be represented by "Aperu" in the Egyptian monuments, (See "Records of the Past," vol. vi. p. 59; Chabas, "Mélanges Egyptologiques," pp. 42–54; etc.)

as a nation and as a country in Scripture. (See especially Gen. xiv. 1, 9; Isa. xi. 11; xxi. 2; Jer. xxv. 25: xlix. 34—39; Ezek. xxxii. 24; Dan. viii. 2.) Of these passages, the one which most exactly fixes the locality is the last; where Daniel tells us that "Shushan the palace" was "in the province of Elam," and that, being there, he "saw in a vision," and behold, he "was by the river Ulai." Now, "Shushan the palace," where Nehemiah waited on king Artaxerxes (Neh. i. 1), and where king Ahasuerus (Xerxes) held his court in the days of Mordecai and Esther (Esth. i. 2; ii. 5; etc.), is beyond any reasonable doubt identified with Susa, the capital of Persia, and the ordinary residence of the court from the time of Darius Hystaspis to the conquest of Alexander. In the immediate neighbourhood of Susa was a river called by the Greeks Eulæus,* which is quite manifestly Daniel's "Ulai." Susa, moreover, though it became the chief capital of the Persian kings, was not, strictly speaking, in Persia, but was the capital of a separate and very ancient kingdom, which bore many names, one of them being *Elymaïs*. The combined resemblance of the three names, *Elymaïs* with *Elam*, *Susa* with *Shushan*, and *Ulai* with *Eulæus*, cannot possibly be accidental; and the passage of Daniel would therefore, even if it stood alone, suffice to show what country is intended by Elam. It may be added, however, that all the other passages quoted above (and several besides

* See Arrian, Exp. Alex. vii. 7; Diod. Sic. xix. 17; Plin. H. N. vi. 27; etc.

them) confirm the conclusion thus arrived at; and especially it may be noted that the *Mosaic* Elam is certainly in this quarter, Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, who invaded Palestine in the time of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 1), being lord paramount over Amraphel, king of *Shinar*, who must have borne rule in Babylonia, on the confines of Elymaïs.

We have thus fixed the locality of the people designated by the word "Elam" to the region on the left or east bank of the Tigris, opposite Babylonia, and lying between that country and Persia proper. But a few words more must be added with respect to the people themselves. We find the tract in question designated by different names. Sometimes it is called Susiana or Susis; sometimes Kissia; sometimes Elam, or Elymaïs. The first of these names is a mere derivative from the name of the capital, Susa; but the other two indicate the fact that the country was inhabited by two entirely distinct races. The Elamites or Elymæans were probably the earlier incomers, and from them the tract was called Elymaïs. They were subsequently overrun and conquered by the Kissians or Cossæans (Cushites?), who became the governing race, and called the country after themselves, Kissia. We find the two classes of inhabitants mentioned together in the book of Ezra (chap. iv. 9), and they even continued separate and distinct to the time of Strabo.

Asshur.—The word "Asshur," which occurs with great frequency in Scripture, is, except in this place,

in the parallel passage of Chronicles (1 Chr. i. 17), and in one or two others, uniformly translated in our version by "Assyria." Nor is it possible for even the most inattentive reader to entertain the slightest doubt that the country which the Greeks and Romans designated by that name is intended. Asshur is the country of which Sennacherib and Esarhaddon are kings (2 Kings xix. 13, 37), whose capital is Nineveh (verse 36), and whose river is Hiddekel (Gen. ii. 14)—the Tigris.* This identification is so universally accepted that it would be a waste of words to say more about it. The sacred writer means *certainly* to tell us that among the descendants of Shem was included the great nation of the Assyrians.

ARPHAXAD.—By "Arphaxad," or "Arpachshad" (as the word reads in the Hebrew), occurring as it does in the same sentence with Elam and Asshur, we must certainly understand a tribe or nation. But it is impossible to say what tribe or nation is intended. The only suggestion worthy of a moment's attention that has ever been made, is to regard the word as designating the inhabitants of a portion of Assyria which was known to the Greeks and Romans as Arrapachitis. The root of this word is Arapkha (or Arapcha), which was an Assyrian town of no great importance, occasionally mentioned in the Inscriptions. Now Arapkha does certainly, to a considerable extent, resemble Arpachshad. Still

* See Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," ad voc. HIDDEKEL (vol. i. p. 802).

it is far from being the same word. The two have really but one element in common, which is *arpa* (=*arba*), the Assyrian for "four." *Arpa-kha* (or Arap-kha) meant "the four fish," and was probably the city where the four sacred fish, often seen on cylinders, were special objects of worship. *Arpa-ch'shad* could not mean this. *Ch'shad* would be an entirely new root. But take away the supposed identity of name, and there is no ground at all for connecting Arphaxad with Arrapachitis. Arrapachitis never appears in the Assyrian times as a distinct country, nor is there any reason for believing that it then formed a separate division or province of Assyria. Its inhabitants were pure Assyrians—at least they are never in any way distinguished from the rest of the nation. On the whole, therefore, it would seem that this identification must be set aside; and if so, it must be confessed that we have no clue to the race (or country) intended, the word occurring nowhere else in Scripture, except in the parallel passage of Chronicles (1 Chr. i. 17).

Lud.—The Semitic "Lud" have been generally identified with the Lydians;* but this identification, which is based wholly on the similarity of the names, is rendered extremely improbable, by the geographic position of the people. It is not in the manner of our author to make a violent transition from one

* Bötticher, "Rudimenta Mythologiæ Semiticæ," p. 13; Lenormant, "Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient," vol. i. p. 102; P. Smith, "Ancient History," vol. i. p. 50.

locality to another, only in order to come back with equal suddenness to the point which he abruptly quitted. If by "Lud" here he had intended Lydia, the order of the names would have been Elam, Asshur (Arphaxad), Aram, Lud; not Elam, Asshur (Arphaxad), Lud, Aram. We must look for Lud in a position between Asshur and Aram, or, in other words, between Assyria and Syria, not in the far-off region bordering upon the Ægean Sea. Now here it happens that we find in the Egyptian Inscriptions a people called *Ruten* or *Luden* (the words would be indistinguishable in Egyptian), who possess considerable power, and are frequently engaged in war with the great Pharaohs* of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries B.C., under one of whom Moses, it is probable, wrote his history. These *Luden* dwelt north of Palestine, and in the near vicinity of Mesopotamia, thus approaching very close to the Assyrians, who at an early time spread themselves westward at least as far as the Khabour river. It is thus not improbable that they are the people whom Moses designates here by the word Lud. If they are not, the name "Lud" must be regarded as one of those which defy identification.

ARAM.—Aram, which occurs in Scripture with the same frequency as Asshur, is, like Asshur, a name concerning the application of which there is no doubt. Our translators almost always render the

* As Thothmes III. ("Records of the Past," vol. ii. pp. 45, 53); Thothmes IV. (ibid. vol. iv. p. 15); Seti I., Rameses II., and Rameses III.

word, as did the Septuagint interpreters, by "Syria;" and the term, though etymologically quite distinct, is beyond a doubt, in its use by the Hebrews, a near eqivalent for the "Syria" of the Greeks and Romans. It designates a people distinct from, yet closely allied with, the Assyrians, which, in the remotest times whereto history reaches, was established in the valley of the middle Euphrates, and in the tract between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean. This people, known to itself as Aramæan, continued the predominant race in the country to the time of the Mohammedan conquest. It produced a literature as early as the fourth century of our era, portions of which are still extant, as the works of St. Ephraem Syrus, the Peshito or Syriac version of the Old and New Testaments, the Syriac translations of St. Ignatius's Epistles, and the like. Remnants of the race are found at the present day near Damascus, and also in the Kurdish mountains, where they are known as "Nestorians," or as "Chaldees," * the former title designating their religion, the latter their supposed identity with the people of Nebuchadnezzar.

Of the six races, therefore, mentioned in Gen. x. 21, 22 as descended from Shem, we can certainly identify four, and we can probably identify one other; but with regard to one we have to confess ignorance. "Eber," "Elam," "Asshur," and "Aram" correspond beyond a doubt to the Hebrews, the Elamites or Elymæans, the Assyrians, and the Syrians; Lud

* See Layard's "Nineveh and its Remains," vol. i. ch. viii.

represents probably the *Ruten* or *Luden* of the Egyptians; Arphaxad alone is unknown to us, and cannot be said, so far as our present information goes, to designate any historical people.

The races mentioned being identified as far as is possible, we have now to inquire what modern ethnology teaches as to them, and especially as to their diversity or resemblance one to another. Now here we have at the outset to put on one side two of the races, since concerning them modern ethnology is silent. Nothing is known of the ethnic character of the people called by the Egyptians *Ruten* or *Luden*, with whom the Egyptian monarchs of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries were engaged in such frequent wars. By their locality they might reasonably be either Semites or Hamites, for while they adjoin Aram and Assyria on the one hand, they approach nearly to the Hittites and Canaanites on the other. But we have absolutely no evidence of their ethnic character;* and it is therefore necessary to regard them as beyond the limits of the present inquiry. Similarly, with respect to the Elamites, who again might naturally by their position be either Semitic or Hamitic, since they touch Assyria in one direction and Babylonia in another, we have no indications of ethnic type on which we can rely. The early names in the country,

* Sir G. Wilkinson observes that they are represented with red hair and blue eyes upon the Egyptian monuments (Rawlinson's "Herodotus," vol. ii. p. 302, second edition), which is rather against their being Semites. But their features have a Semitic cast. (See a woodcut in the same work, vol. iv. p. 46, No. II. 7.)

so far as we know them, are Hamitic; but the Cushite invasion of the territory took place at so remote a date that this cannot be considered as proving anything. The name Elam itself (עילם from עלה) and Shushan (שושן), which we are told meant "a lily" (Athen. "Deipns." xii. p. 513), would seem to be Semitic; but it would be unsafe to conclude anything from names which reach us only through foreigners.

The inquiry must therefore be limited to the three races of the Hebrews, the Assyrians, and the Syrians or Aramæans. Is there, or is there not, reason to believe, from facts known to us through the media of scientific research and profane history, apart from any consideration of Scripture, that these three races, concerning which alone of those here mentioned by the genealogist we have any extensive knowledge, were cognate one to another? Let us hear what the first ethnologist of the day says on the subject.

Professor Max Müller speaks of the Aramaic and the Hebrew as two main branches of the Semitic stock.* He regards the close connection of the Syriac and Hebrew languages as so patent and so universally acknowledged a fact, that he considers argument on the subject to be superfluous. He concludes from this fact that the races which spoke the languages were "agnate descendants of Shem,"† ethnically allied, that is, in the closest

* "Languages of the Seat of War," p. 23.

† Ibid. p. 26.

possible way, as near to each other as Bretons to Welsh, as Russians to Poles, or as Italians to Wallachians.*

And this indeed has been allowed for many centuries—ever since Hebrew and Syriac first became objects of study to Occidentals. But it is only recently that it has been rendered possible to pronounce on scientific grounds that the great people of the Assyrians, which the genealogist in Gen. x. distinctly connects with the Syrians and the Hebrews, is most fully entitled to the place assigned it in his list, being closely cognate with those two nations. The discovery by Mr. Layard, M. Botta, Mr. Loftus, and others, of numerous and lengthy inscriptions among the débris of the palaces inhabited by the Assyrian kings, acting as a stimulus to the labours of Dr. Hincks, M. Oppert, and, above all, of Sir Henry Rawlinson, has resulted in the recovery of the ancient Assyrian language, which has been submitted to analysis, and is now almost as well known as Syriac or Hebrew itself. The French *savant*, M. Oppert, has recently published an elaborate "Grammaire Assyrienne;" Mr. Norris of the British Museum has brought out a complete "Assyrian Dictionary."

* Only a very crude and shallow criticism will object to this view, that as the Syriac language was unintelligible to the Jews generally (2 Kings xviii. 26), it must have belonged to a different family of speech. A very small dialectic difference between two tongues is sufficient to make the speakers of them mutually unintelligible. An ordinary Breton would not understand a Welshman, a Pole a Russian, or a Wallachian a native of Italy.

The grammar and construction of the language are perfectly well defined, the only obscurity that remains attaching to the meaning of certain words, and the phonetic value of the names. And the conclusion which linguistic scholars have universally drawn from the careful study and analysis of this ancient form of speech is, that the language is Semitic, nearly akin to both Hebrew and Syriac, but, on the whole, closer to the former.

Again, the physiognomy of the ancient Assyrians has been fully revealed by the long series of sculptures dug out of the ruins of Nineveh, Calah, and other Assyrian cities and now adorning the walls of the Louvre and the British Museum; and the unmistakably Jewish character of the whole cast of countenance is patent to all, and has been generally recognized.

The result is, that of the six races stated in Gen. x. 21, 22 to have been common descendants of the patriarch Shem, while one is incapable of identification, and on two others modern ethnology has no means of pronouncing a judgment, the remaining three, on which alone the science has anything to say, are distinctly pronounced to be sister races, to belong to a single type; and to that type the science, here for once acknowledging the historical authority of Scripture, albeit amid a few faint murmurs from some of its less distinguished professors, assigns formally a distinctive name, embodying the scriptural fact—the name of "SHEMITE" or "SEMITIC."

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE SEMITIC RACES.

Subdivisions of Aram—Uz or Huz, a race of Central Arabia—Hul and Gether, unknown—Mash, a wrong reading for Meshech—may designate the Syrian element in Cappadocia—Descendants of Arphaxad—Races descended from Joktan—Almodad, the Jurhum or Beni Mudad—Sheleph, the Salapeni or Sulaf—Hazarmaveth, the people of Hadramaut—Jerah, the people of Yerákh—Hadoram, uncertain—Uzal, the people of Sana in the Yemen—Diklah, the people of Dakalah in the Yemen—Obal and Abimael, uncertain—Sheba, the Sabæans—Ophir, the people of Aphar or Saphar—Havilah, the people of Khawlán—Jobab, perhaps the Jobarites of Ptolemy—All these races Arabian—Arabs predominantly Semitic—Geographical position of the Semites intermediate—Summary of the whole argument.

"AND the children of Aram; Uz, and Hul, and Gether, and Mash." (Gen. x. 23.)

From the analogy of the rest of the chapter, we may assume that in this brief summary the genealogist particularizes either certain main ethnic subdivisions of the Syrians, or certain leading points of their geographic emplacement. The verse, however, is peculiarly obscure, and open to a great variety of interpretations. Of the four new terms which occur in it, one alone, "Uz," obtains any further illustra-

tion from the rest of Scripture. The other three terms, "Hul," "Gether," and "Mash" (if that is the right reading), are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα,—terms which occur nowhere else than in this genealogy,—which must therefore have gone out of use at a very early date, and with respect to which it is difficult even to form a probable conjecture. The term "Mash," however, is very probably an incorrect reading, as will be shown further on in this chapter.

Uz, or Huz, as the word is more correctly rendered in Gen. xxii. 21, was at a tolerably early date the name of a country (and probably also of a people, in the neighbourhood of the Sabæans and the Chaldees. (See Job i. 1, 15, 17.) It was readily accessible to the Temanites, the Shuhites (ib. ii. 11), and the Buzites (ib. xxxii. 2). The Edomites at one time held possession of it (Lam. iv. 21). It was a country suitable for the breeding and nurture of sheep, oxen, asses, and camels (Job i. 3). These various notes of locality long ago inclined the bulk of Scriptural expositors to place Uz in some portion of the tract called Arabia Deserta, the only tract which can be regarded as adjacent to the three countries of Chaldæa, Saba, and Edom. But till recently it was impossible to give to Uz any more definite emplacement. It was assigned to Arabia Deserta, but to no special part of that vast region. Now, however, we know, from an inscription of Esarhaddon,* that there were in Central Arabia, beyond the Jebel Shomer, about the modern countries

* See the author's "Ancient Monarchies," vol. ii. pp. 470.

of Upper and Lower Kaseem, two regions called respectively BAZU and KHAZU, which, considering the very close connection of Huz and Buz in Scripture (see Gen. xxii. 21), it is only reasonable to regard as the countries which those two names indicate. This identification enables us to assign to Uz or Huz a tract nearly in the middle of North Arabia, not very far from the famous district of Nejd.

HUL and GETHER, which are names that occur in no other part of Scripture, and which have no near equivalents in the ancient or modern geography of Western Asia, admit of no satisfactory explanation. They probably designate two Aramæan nations which either disappeared or changed their appellations at a very early date. Nothing more can be said of them;* for it is idle to speculate where we have no data at all beyond the names themselves, and where those names do not point plainly, or even probably, to any known race.

MASH.—Here the case is somewhat different; not that "Mash" itself is any more intelligible than "Gether" or "Hul," but that in this instance there is, besides "Mash," another reading. In 1 Chron. i. 17, the Hebrew text runs thus: "The sons of Shem; Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram, and Uz, and Hul, and Gether, and *Meshech*." It is evident that here the "sons of

* The least improbable explanation which has been attempted of Hul supposes it to designate the tract about the Lake of Merom (now the Bahr-el-*Huleh*), part of which bears the name of Ard-el-*Huleh*, and part of *Jaulán*, anciently *Gaulanitis*. (See Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 839).

Aram," or branch races included under the Aramæans, are intended to be enumerated immediately after their parent, Aram. "Uz, and Hul, and Gether" occur exactly as in Genesis; while the fourth place is filled up with another, but not very different name, "Meshech." Now, if this were all, there would be a difficulty in choosing between the two readings, each having, so far, an equal amount of authority, and there being no reason why we should prefer either Genesis to Chronicles or Chronicles to Genesis. But the scale which would otherwise be evenly balanced, is turned by the fact that the Septuagint version of the Old Testament has "Meshech" (*Μοσόχ*) in both places. We may assume from this that some copies of the Hebrew Scriptures had "Meshech" and not "Mash," in Gen. x. 23; and, as there is no evidence of any variation in 1 Chron. i. 17, "Meshech" must be regarded as having a preponderance of evidence in its favour, and as therefore entitled to be considered the true reading. Here, however, we come upon another difficulty. "Meshech" has already occurred in the genealogy among the Japhetic races; and having so occurred, should (it may be thought) not have appeared again. But the double occurrence of a name in the lists under consideration, which is not limited to the instance before us, but occurs likewise in the cases of Lud (verses 13 and 22), Havilah (verses 7 and 29), and Sheba (verses 7 and 28), may be accounted for in two ways. Either two distinct races may be intended, to which quite unconnectedly the same

name has happened to become attached, as was the case, probably, in ancient times, with the Iberians of the Caspian and with those of the Spanish peninsula, and certainly in modern times with the Georgians of the old Iberian country and the Georgians of the North American continent; or the genealogist may have intended in each case the same race, that race being in reality a mixed one, in part descended from one patriarch, in part from another. In the present instance the latter supposition is the more probable; for there is abundant evidence that the population of Cappadocia—the true original country of the Moschi (see page 173)—was a mixed one, and a good deal of evidence connecting a portion of the population with Syria or Aram. Herodotus, * Strabo, † and other writers, ‡ call the Cappadocians of their day "White Syrians," an appellation that cannot possibly have belonged to the ruling caste in the country, which was undoubtedly Aryan, § but which must have had a basis in fact. If the Meshech (Moschi—the primitive inhabitants of Cappadocia, whom the Aryans conquered—were a mixed race, partly Japhetic, partly Aramæan, all the statements of the Greek writers connecting Cappadocia with Syria, and even Assyria, would be accounted for.

* Herod. i. 72. v. 49.

† Strab. xii. p. 788.

‡ As Scylax, Peripl. p. 80; Dionys. Perieg., l. 772; Ptolemy, Geograph., v. 6; Apollon Rhod. Argonaut. ii. 946; etc.

§ See Sir H. Rawlinson in the author's "Herodotus," vol. i. p. 537.

Assuming the view here taken to be correct, we may say that of the four nations intended in verse 23, whilst two are wholly unknown, the two others are to some extent known to us. Uz designates a race which in remote times inhabited a tract nearly in the centre of North Arabia. Meshech, in the genealogy of Aram, points to a people which became mixed with the Japhetic Moschi in Cappadocia. Now there are grounds for affirming, quite independently of Scripture, that in both these places there was anciently a Semitic population. Northern and Central Arabia have, from the earliest times to the present day, been held by Semites; and there is no reason to believe that races of any other stock have at any time settled there. We should perhaps have expected in the locality which has been assigned to Uz, Arabs rather than Aramæans; but the two races have always touched each other, and the line of demarcation between them has no doubt varied at different periods. In Cappadocia the Semitic inhabitants are distinctly declared to be "Syrians," —Syrians who only differed from their brethren south of the Taurus range in having a much lighter complexion.

"And Arphaxad begat Salah; and Salah begat Eber. And unto Eber were born two sons: the name of one was Peleg (for in his days was the earth divided); and his brother's name was Joktan" (verses 24 and 25).

This passage stands in strong contrast with the rest of the chapter. Elsewhere the genealogist is

mainly, if not wholly, dealing with races. Here he for a while turns his attention to persons. (Compare ch. xi. 10—26, where these names occur in a purely personal list.) His main object in the latter part of the chapter appears to have been to complete his account of the races descended from Shem by an enumeration of the various branches of the Joktanites, whom he regarded as one of the most important sections of the Semitic family. As, however, that branch really derived its name from a person, and that person was a somewhat remote descendant of Shem, he determined in the instance to give the complete genealogy. Accordingly he referred Joktan to Shem through three intermediate steps, thus tracing down the actual descendants of Noah to the sixth generation, and anticipating, so far, the narrative of the next chapter. Having done this, and come to Joktan, he returned to his main purpose, and completed it in the four verses which we have now to consider.

"And Joktan begat Almodad, and Sheleph, and Hazarmaveth, and Jerah, and Hadoram, and Uzal, and Diklah, and Obal, and Abimael, and Sheba, and Ophir, and Havilah, and Jobab: all these were the sons of Joktan" (verses 26—29).

Arab tradition makes Joktan, who in Arabic is called *Kahtan*, the great progenitor of all the purest tribes of Central and Southern Arabia; and though there is nothing in Scripture directly to connect Joktan himself with the Arabian peninsula, yet the list of his descendants completely bears out the

Arab tradition. It has been already shown (p. 205) that Havilah and Sheba designate important Arab tribes or districts. And the best Arabic scholars are of opinion that the great majority of the other names in the above list may be connected either probably or certainly with this locality. To show this, it may be as well briefly to run through the names in question.

ALMODAD is reasonably regarded as an equivalent word to the Arabic *Mudad*, or *El Mudad*, a famous person in Arabian history, chief of a tribe called Jurhum, and father of the wife of Ishmael. The very form of the name is Arabic, its initial element being the Arabic article, *al* or *el*, "the."

SHELEPH.—The "Salapeni" (*Σαλαπηνοί*) are mentioned by Ptolemy* among the ancient inhabitants of Arabia Felix; and it is no doubt the same tribe which appears in the geographer Yacut as the *Es-Sulaf*, or *Beni-es-Silfan*, a people inhabiting the Yemen. The traveller Carsten Niebuhr, the father of the historian, found the race still existing in his day, inhabiting a tract of the Yemen, which he calls "Sälfie."† These names almost exactly reproduce the Hebrew Sheleph, and are a sufficient indication of the locality and people intended.

HAZARMAVETH.—The word is, as nearly as possible, identical with the Arabic *Hadramaut*, which is still the name of a tract and people on the south-eastern coast of Arabia, between the Yemen and

* "Geograph.," vi. 7.

† "Description de l'Arabie," p. 215.

the Mahra country. The people were known to the Greeks and Romans as the Chattramotitæ, Chattramitæ or Atramitæ. They have been at all times one of the most powerful of the Arab tribes.

JERAH.—A fortress named *Yerâkh*, which exactly reproduces the Hebrew word here used (יֶרַח), exists in the Mahra country, adjoining Hadramaut to the east. This may be a trace of the tribe here intended, which is, however, otherwise unknown to us.

HADORAM.—Some compare this name with that of the tribe called Atramitæ; but that term more probably represents the people of Hadramaut. (See under HAZARMAVETH.)

UZAL was the old name of the modern Saná, the capital city of the Yemen, which is still a town of some consequence. It was in ancient times one of the most flourishing of the Arab communities, and is compared by the early Mohammedan geographers to Damascus. The Greek and Roman writers probably intend to speak of it under the name of Auzara, or Ausara, which they call a city of the Gebanitæ.

DIKLAH has been on insufficient grounds supposed to represent the Minæi, a famous people of ancient Arabia. It is more probably represented by the city Dakalah, a place of some importance in the Yemen.

OBAL and ABIMAEL are names that have not as yet been probably identified with any known place or tribe in Arabia. Like most of the other names in this series, they occur only here and in the corre-

sponding passage of Chronicles (1 Chron. i. 22), where Obal appears as Ebal.

SHEBA.—The identity of Sheba with the great and important race of the Sabæans, the most celebrated people of Arabia in the ancient times, has been already maintained in a former chapter.* The occurrence of the name, both here, among the Joktanites, and in verse 7, among the descendants of Cush, is best explained by supposing that the Sabæans were a mixed race, composed in part of Cushites, in part of Joktanite, *i.e.*, of Semitic, Arabs. There is reason to believe that the latter element in the race preponderated.

OPHIR is mentioned so frequently as a place in Scripture, that it might appear there could be little difficulty in fixing its locality. Few points of sacred geography have, however, been more controverted. Ophir has been placed in Arabia, in India, in Ceylon, in Eastern Africa, in Phrygia, and in South America, where it has been identified with Peru! But the advocates of these various views would probably, one and all admit that the "Ophir" of the present passage, intervening, as it does, between Sheba and Havilah, must be sought in the Arabian peninsula. Now in the Periplus ascribed to Arrian, one of the most ancient works on Arabian geography, Aphar (*Ἀφάρ*) appears as the metropolis of the Sabæans.† Ptolemy ‡ calls this same city Sapphara (*Σοπφάρα*);

* See above, p. 207.

† Arrian, "Peripl. Mar. Eryth." p. 7.

‡ "Geograph." vi. 7.

and there seems to be no doubt that is the city which is now known as *Saphar*, or *Zaphar*. There is every reason to regard this place and its inhabitants as the place and people here intended by Moses.

HAVILAH, like Sheba, has been discussed in a former chapter.* It designates no doubt the district of Arabia Felix, known as Khawlân. Here, probably, as in Sheba, the Hamites and Semites were intermingled, tribes descended from the two patriarchs having intermarried and blended together.

JOBAB.—This tribe is not elsewhere mentioned in Scripture. It has been identified by many Biblical critics with the Jobaritæ (*Ἰωβαρίται*) mentioned by Ptolemy among the Arabian nations, which some suggest ought to be read Jobabitæ (*Ἰωβαβίται*). But this identification is very uncertain.

Thus, it appears that, of the thirteen names in the Joktanite list, at least eight are traceable in Arabic nomenclature, some certainly, as Sheba and Hazarmaveth, the others probably. And we may therefore conclude that the intention of the genealogist was to assign to the descendants of Joktan the Semite a location in the Arabian peninsula, and chiefly in the Yemen, to which most of the names belong.

What, then, does modern ethnology teach with regard to the Arabians? Beyond a doubt, two things principally—first, that, with the exception of certain races upon the south coast,† they are homogeneous, clearly of one blood, resembling each other

* See above, p. 206. † Ibid. p. 209.

most closely, alike in language, manners, and customs, traditions, and physical conformation; secondly, that the type of their language is Semitic, its inflections, syntax, and vocabulary bearing, all of them, a near resemblance to those of the Assyrians, the Syrians, and the Hebrews. The entire result, so far as the Semites are concerned, is, that, whereas ethnologists, proceeding mainly on the facts of language, divide the Semitic family into five main branches—the Aramæan, the Hebrew, the Phœnician, the Assyrian or Assyro-Babylonian, and the Arabian, Moses, in his genealogy of Shem, distinctly recognises four out of the five divisions—Asshur standing for the Assyrians, Aram for the Syrians or Aramæans, Eber for the Hebrews, and Joktan for the Joktanite, or pure Arabs. Moses adds to the Semitic races known to the ethnologist, two others, the Elamites and the Ludites, concerning whom ethnology says nothing. He omits the Phœnicians, who in his time had not, it is probable, acquired any importance, or made the movement, which first brought them into notice, from the shores of the Persian Gulf to those of the Mediterranean.*

Finally, it may be noticed, that, whereas the Japhetic and Hamitic races are, each of them, geographically continuous, the former spread over all the northern regions known to the genealogist —Greece, Thrace, Scythia, most of Asia Minor, Armenia, and Media,† the latter over all the south and the south-west, North Africa, Egypt, Nubia,

* Herod. i. 1. † See above, p. 191.

Ethiopia, Southern and South-eastern Arabia, and Babylonia*—so the Semitic races are located in what may be called one region, that region being the central one, lying intermediate between the Japhetic region upon the north, and the Hamitic one upon the south. Syria, Palestine, Northern and Central Arabia, Assyria, and Elymaïs, stretch from west to east in a continuous line which reaches from the Mediterranean to the mountains of Luristan. It was this intermediate position of the Semites, which brought them in contact, on the one hand with Japhetic races, as in Cappadocia,† on the other with Hamitic, as in Palestine, in the Yemen, in Babylonia, and Elymaïs.

The examination of Genesis x., which has been here attempted, may now terminate. It has been shown that in no respect is there any contradiction between the teaching of the modern science of ethnology and this venerable record. On the contrary, the record, rightly interpreted, completely harmonizes with the science, and not only so, but even anticipates many of the most curious and remarkable of the discoveries which ethnology has made in comparatively recent times. It does not set up to be, and it certainly is not complete. It is a genealogical arrangement of the races best known to Moses and to those for whom he wrote, not a scientific scheme embracing all the tribes and nations existing in the world at the time. To find

* See p. 197. † See p. 244.

fault with it for its omissions is absurd, since it makes no profession of completeness. Could error be proved in it, the argument would be of consequence. But the Christian may with confidence defy his adversaries to point out any erroneous, or even any improbable statements in the entire chapter from its commencement to its close. *Τῷ ἀληθεῖ πάντα συνᾴδει τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, τῷ δὲ ψευδεῖ ταχὺ διαφωνεῖ τἀληθές.* The thorough harmony which exists between eth ıological science and this unique record is a strong argument for the truth of both.

APPENDICES.*

I.

ANTIQUITY OF EGYPTIAN CIVILIZATION.

By Professor Owen, F. R. S.

My attention has been called to the remarks of the Rev. Canon Rawlinson on Egyptian Civilization. The writer opposes to a statement of mine on the Chronology of Egypt the diversity of opinions on that subject by Egyptologists.

On this line of objection I may remark, that the value to be assigned to discrepant conclusions on a matter of scientific research must rest on the evidence with which such conclusions may be severally supported.

With regard to the first authority cited as "manifestly conflicting with my estimate" (page 17), that notion rests on an assumption that the commencement of Egypt as a civilized and governed community dates from the "erection of the Pyramid." The structures which the President of the British Association cites as exemplifying the attainment in Egypt of the greatest perfection in the art of building, are the three "Great Pyramids" at Ghizeh, the northern graveyard of the once mighty city of Memphis.

But these are not mere superposed accumulations of unwrought or roughly-wrought stone, such as might be argued to exemplify the dawn of civilization. They manifest the degree of perfection

* See page 150.

ascribed to them by Sir John Hawkshaw, in all the different branches of the art of construction.

The wrought masses of stone of the body of the building—truly its walls, though of mighty thickness—were skilfully extracted from the rocky geological formation on which the pyramids are based. Evidences of the skilled, systematic quarrying operations surround the "wonders." One huge outlier of the nummulitic limestone was purposely left and contemporaneously wrought by colossal sculpture of exquisite art and finish into the form of the world-famous Sphinx.

Other kinds of stone were needed for the complex, though outwardly simple structures, which alone of their date offer themselves to the wondering gaze of the present generation, as they will do to that of future ones.

For the more finished masonry of the outer casing, a limestone of finer grain and more compact texture was required. This the Egyptian builders found in the older tertiary strata on the opposite (Arabian) bank of the Nile. They selected for the quarrying operations a part of the cliff, so situated that the enormous blocks there wrought out and transferred to the rafts could be landed, by the combined forces of the rowers and the current, close to the required spot on the opposite (Libyan) shore.

Remains of the landing-place and causeway may still be traced; and Herodotus deemed this preliminary accessory work scarcely inferior in magnitude and engineering skill to the pyramids themselves.

A third kind of stone used in their construction had to be got at a distance of some hundreds of miles up-stream. I have visited the quarries of red granite near Assouan—the ancient Syene—of the beautiful variety thence called "Syenite," which may be contrasted at the British Museum with the red granite of Aberdeen, which supports the ancient Syenitic sculptures.

The arts of quarrying and of masonry, manifested by the marvellous bulk of granite blocks, the perfection of their shaping, and the fineness of their polished surfaces, were as advanced in Egypt at the date of the pyramids as at any subsequent period, or as they are now practised with the aid of gunpowder and of

steam machinery in the granite quarries and works at Aberdeen. These arts have been lost in Egypt for centuries past; at least, there is no evidence of their practice in any of the constructions since the date of the Mohammedan conquest. The last semi-barbarous victors availed themselves, in the construction of their fortalices and mosques, of the wrought masses of fine limestone with which the First and Second Pyramids were coated, and of the similarly polished masses of granite with which the Third Pyramid—the most beautiful of all, in the Greek historian's estimation—was covered.

This material, moreover, enters into the internal architecture of the Great Pyramid. Emerging from the entry gallery into the grand passage, walled and roofed by mighty masses of polished granite, called the "king's chamber," conducting to the mortuary chapel, contiguous to the chamber of the royal sarcophagus, the unexpected dimensions of the granitic "chamber" impressed me with its resemblance to the side-aisle of a cathedral.

The whole of the known interior structures of Cheops' Pyramid—the central tomb, the roof of which is relieved by a series of "discharging arches," from the enormous superincumbent mass towering to the pyramid's apex; the ventilating shafts, extending at the best angle for their purpose, to open upon the sides of the pyramid; the precisely-estimated slope of both upward and downward passages, in reference to the enormous blocks of granite to be moved along them, hardly, if at all, inferior to the monolithic sarcophagus itself,—all these impressed my architectural and engineering fellow-travellers with the conviction that a mind of high order in their sciences had planned and presided over the construction of the pyramid. The Director-General of the Ordnance Survey, Major-General Sir Henry James, in his "Notes on the Great Pyramid of Egypt" (1869), remarks of the passages:—"Their inclination, which is just the 'angle of rest,' is particularly well chosen, when we consider that these stone-masses would have to slide down to their position. With a greater inclination it would have been very difficult to guide the blocks in their descent, and with a less it would have been difficult to move them." The author here refers to the massive blocks of granite accurately hewn to fill and fit into the mouth of the pas-

sage, and which were needed to bar unauthorized access to the royal tomb.

His must be a cold nature who can view unmoved the exterior of these constructions, mighty in their seeming simplicity. Nor is it surprising that a weak mind should lose its balance in a cognizance of their well-considered complexity.

The hypothesis of the function of the pyramid and its sarcophagus for the purpose of conservation of Divine standards of weights and measures, is not the only one which rests on the assumption that the architect and builders were guided by a "special inspiration."

The opposite extreme is the notion that the alleged rude though mighty cairn exemplifies "the commencement of Egyptian civilization," which, according to Canon Rawlinson, Sir John Hawkshaw "places about B.C. 5000," and which the reverend canon contrasts with the "extravagant" one of 7,000 years.

I will not trespass on the reader's patience with notes of the contemporary temple near to the pyramids recently discovered by Mariette-Bey, Ministerial Conservator of the Antiquities of Egypt. I allude to it as having contained evidences of the rise of the art of sculpture to a height equalling that of architecture. The life-sized statue of Phra Képhrên, discovered in this temple, in its majestic simplicity of character, will bear comparison with that of Watt, by Chantrey, in Westminster Abbey. But the ancient Egyptian sculptor executed his work in the hardest and rarest material that Egypt could produce, viz. diorite.

On the plinth of this statue is the name-shield of its subject, "Kawra," rendered by Herodotus "Kephren," the builder of the Second Pyramid, the successor of Khouwou, or Cheops, builder of the First Pyramid, and the predecessor of Menkera, or Mykerinus, builder of the Third Pyramid.

The names of these three Pharaohs of the fourth dynasty were told to Herodotus on the authority of the same priestly records as were afterwards used by Manetho to compile the history required by the then reigning monarch, his master, Ptolemy Philadelphus. Cheops' name has been found on the stones of his pyramid, and the Third Pyramid has revealed like evidence of its builder, Menkera.

What were the chances that these and most of the other names and records of kings and dynasties of the Old and Middle Empires in Manetho's record, should have been confirmed by contemporary evidence, if there existed grounds of "doubt whether Manetho had any materials for reconstructing the chronology of the Old and Middle Empires?" (page 30.)

How many of my readers may have accepted as well-founded this reflection on the memory of the Egyptian historian, qualified, it is true, by ascriptions of "best intention" in the manufacture of such chronology! Some may even have received as unquestionable Canon Rawlinson's averment of the "manifest confliction" of Sir John Hawkshaw's and my estimates of the "commencement of Egyptian civilization." To most, I presume, it must have occurred that the "Address to the British Association at Bristol" contained no statement or estimate whatever of such commencement.

What the president eloquently expressed was his appreciation, as a professional judge of the matter, of the great perfection to which Egyptian civilization had attained at the period, according to the Manethonian chronicle, now abundantly confirmed, when Cheops, Kephren, and Mykerinus caused those ancient "wonders of the world" to be erected at that period, viz., of the ancient division of Egyptian history, which dates 5,000 years ago.

Of all the marvels of this history the manifestation of the dawn of civilization by such works, agreeably with the conception of Canon Rawlinson, would be the greatest. The birth of Pallas from the brain of Jove would be its parallel.

Unprepossessed and sober experience, however, teaches that arts, language, literature, are of slow growth, the results of gradual development, as would be expected in a civilization which had culminated in a creed, a ritual, a priesthood, in convictions of a future life and judgment, of "the resurrection of *the* body," with the resulting instinct of its preservation—an instinct in which kings alone could indulge to the height of a pyramid. The administrative arrangements through which compulsory labours could be regulated and carried on, with more consideration than Mohamed Ali gave or cared for in the construction of the Mahmoudi Canal; the monthly relays of Pharaoh's workmen; the

commissariat as it was recorded on the original polished exterior of the Great Pyramid; the settled grades of Egyptian society, and the "Thirty Commandments" governing their moral life,—"commandments" by the people held to be "Divine," seeing that thereby the soul was tested, and the deeds of the flesh weighed before the judgment seat of Osiris—these are not the signs of an incipient civilization. The period of incubation of such progress, if one had to found an estimate by the analogy of the proved conditions of prehistoric man, could not be deemed "extravagant" at the sum of years I have assigned, dating from such incipiency; it is more likely to prove inadequate.

The studies of the geologist have expanded ideas of time in a degree analogous to those of space gained by astronomy. Concurrent expansion is rewarding the investigator of the evidences of the human race. My geological observations in Egypt begat a greater confidence in the deductions from lately discovered inscriptions than in the arbitrary curtailments of Manetho's records by Josephus, Syncellus, and other critics.

Three dynasties of Egyptian kings preceded that of which the builders of the Great Pyramids were members. Mariette-Bey, whose discoveries have added the most weighty testimony in support of "the materials" at Manetho's command for his records of the chronology of the Old Empire, assigns to the duration of those dynasties, a period of 769 years. Dr. Birch gives 777 years "according to the total of the years of the reigns."

But Egypt is recorded to have been a civilized and governed community before the time of Menes.

Civilization, it is true, is an arbitrary term. Anthropologists have not yet settled the boundary-line between a savage and a civilized people.

The obtaining sustenance from wild plants and animals, without any of the arts of culture and domestication, would apply as a definition to the savageism of the aborigines of Australia and of the Andaman Isles, of the Boschismen of South Africa, of the Mandans and other "Red Indians" of America. The pastoral community of a group of nomad families, as portrayed in the Pentateuch, may be admitted as an early step in civilization.

But how far in advance of this stage is a nation administered by a kingly government, consisting of grades of society, with divisions of labour, of which one kind, assigned to the priesthood, was to record or chronicle the names and dynasties of the kings, the durations, and chief events of their reigns!

The traditions of the priestly historians, as received and recorded by Herodotus and Diodorus, refer to a long antecedent period of the existence of the Egyptians as an administered community; the final phase of which, prior to the assumption of the crown by Menes, was analogous to that of the judges in Israel, or the Papacy at Rome, a government, viz., of priests.

The obstruction to the acceptance of the inductive evidence, on which alone a lasting knowledge of ethnology and of the antiquity of the human race can be had, is the same which opposed the progress of the science of geology, and retarded for two centuries or more the demonstration of the causes which, in the long course of ages, modified the crust of the earth; incompatibility, namely, "with the chronology of the Bible," especially, "if it be borne in mind that, *according to the Septuagint version*, the date of the Deluge was certainly anterior to B.C. 3000," (page 31).

How far anterior to that date, Canon Rawlinson leaves to conjecture. According to the "Sacred Chronology" of Bishop Russell, the latest writer of eminence on that topic, whose conclusions are mainly those of Hales and Jackson, and, like them, based on the Septuagint, the date of the universal Deluge, as detailed in Gen. vi., vii., viii., is 5,060 years from that of the present writing. It must be admitted that there is yet much uncertainty as to ancient Biblical chronology.

II.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE CHINESE.

By the Rev. Dr. Edkins, Pekin.

CHINA has a very old look. The walls of its cities make the traveler think of Old Testament times. The character of the people belongs more to the middle ages than to the nineteenth century. It appears wonderfully stereotyped. Change proceeds among the people, but it is not so perceptible nor so rapid as elsewhere. Tennyson wrote, "Better thirty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay." Evidently the poet thought it preferable to live in a country where progress is swift. All, however, cannot live in Europe, and one advantage that those possess whose lot takes them to "the gorgeous east" is, that they can study the old world in new times.

The reason why the Chinese continue to remain so much what they have been, and take a certain pride in opposing all tendency to progress, is to be looked for in national character and isolation. Had they mingled in the stream of history, had they been spectators of the world's revolutions, and shared in them, had they traveled much in foreign countries, and learned to live in foreign ways, and practice foreign usages, they would not have hung back so much as they now do in the rear of the rest of the world upon the onward path of change.

The native character has not a little self-confidence, which is justified by their past. They can now look back on four thousand years of history. During this time the Chinese have made

steady if slow advancement in enlightenment, and in the discovery of the means by which the realm of nature could be subjugated to human uses.

The national spirit, when looked at broadly, is really civilized and progressive, or they would not have such a noble history of useful inventions to be proud of. We are too ready to pity and despise as barbarism that which is in reality a type of progress more steady and long-continued, though less brilliant and energetic, than our own.

Fifteen centuries ago they used pencils for writing made of weasels' hair, as they now do, and wrote with characters of the same shape and size as at present. This is a remarkable instance of slowness in changing. But then they have, during that time, originated the practice of printing books, and that, too, four centuries before the commencement of European printing. This is a proof of progress still more remarkable. The critical foreigner complains that they still hold to the use of hieroglyphics. He thinks that after four thousand years they might be willing to make a change, and that they ought to admit the undoubted superiority of an alphabet. But they may say, in defence of themselves, that their written characters are more suited for perpetuity than the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, and that their language not being polysyllabic, there is much to be said for their continuing to use a system of separate signs for every word.

This singular civilization, coming down from high antiquity, seems to bring Egypt and Babylon before us in contemporary form. The artisans of Thebes and Memphis may be seen to live again in Canton or Soochow. The turning-lathe, the potter's wheel, and the weaving-loom, in modern Chinese cities, show us what the streets of the cities on the banks of the Nile and Euphrates would now be if the ancient inhabitants of those regions had, like the Chinese, found out the secret of perpetuating themselves.

The credibility and age of the first Chinese books, the time when writing originated, the possibility of the separation on safe grounds of early myth from genuine history, are all matters most desirable to be known. They may, with many kindred

subjects, receive illustration from a brief general inquiry into the antiquity of the Chinese.

Opinion has oscillated in a singular way on this question. The Jesuit missionaries commenced their work in China three centuries ago, and when they entered on the study of the literature, they became filled with admiration of it. The intelligent and educated natives who at that time in considerable numbers received Christian baptism, never parted with their reverence for the character and teaching of China's ancient sages. They communicated their regard for the history and literature of their country to their European instructors. Catholic Europe, and especially France, became in the seventeenth century, through the productions of Jesuit authors upon China, imbued with a high feeling of admiration for the wisdom and intelligence of the Chinese, and the trustworthiness of their history. Down to the end of the last century European acquaintance with the country went on increasing, aided by the translations made of the classical books in French and Latin, and the numerous descriptive works and essays published to illustrate the ancient and modern condition of the people whom we have fallen into the habit of calling, with a tone of pleasant sarcasm, the "Celestials." Many of the men who held up China to the world's admiration lie buried in the two chief Catholic cemeteries in the west of Pekin, not far from the city walls. There are the high tombs of Ricci, Schaal, and Verbeist of the older time, and Gaubil and Amyot of the more recent.

Down to the time (twenty years ago) of the publication of Legge's Chinese Classics and the works of Biot, it was the custom among many sober judges to accept the ancient history as given in the classical books. The "Book of History," for example, commences with the reigns of the Emperors Yaou and Shun, B.C. 2356 and 2255, and contains an account of a most destructive deluge which occurred at that time, and from which the country was freed by the diligence, energy, and skill of a heroic man named Ta Yü, who became emperor B.C. 2205. This deluge was not like that of Noah, except in its being said that mountains were covered by the rising floods. The sober student of these days will not follow the example set by some Roman Catholic

missionaries in former times who identified the deluge of Noah with that of the Chinese Yü. The human population was not destroyed in the Chinese deluge. There was no ship. The time that it lasted was nine years. The deluge of the Bible and of the Babylonian tablets would seem to have taken place long before that of China, and to have been wider spread and more devastating in its effects.

The Emperor Yü was one of a group of sages, several of whose sayings have been preserved. They are couched in words which, while very archaic, are not the words of a different language. The Chinese language, in its vocabulary and laws of arrangement in words, as well as in its being monosyllabic, was the same then as now, except that it was less developed, and contained many obsolete expressions.

Yü was the first emperor of the Hea dynasty, and founder of an imperial line which continued for sixteen descents till B.C. 1766. This to the Jesuits seemed all to be trustworthy history, especially as there are passages in the early parts of this most interesting old book which tell of determinations of the times of the equinoxes and solstices from the observed places of certain stars, either in the morning or evening, or at midnight of the four days on which they occurred. The emperor's words, when giving the order to the court astronomers to go and make these observations, are carefully recorded. Then there is a solar eclipse of about B.C. 2000. Astronomical data like these are not found in the Vedas, or the Zendavesta, or in the Books of Moses, or in Homer or Hesiod. They seemed to give a special character of authenticity to this book of old Chinese history.

Du Halde's work on China is unequalled for copiousness, and contains a vast amount of correct information; but the way in which it speaks of early Chinese chronology is much more in accordance with the time when it was compiled than with our own.

He writes: "Two hundred years after the Deluge the sons of Noah arrived in North-Western China." This is neither Scripture nor is it science. It is a rough-and-ready attempt to reconcile the Hebrew account with early Chinese tradition. In this age we proceed more cautiously.

Du Halde goes on to say: "From the reign of Yaou, which began B.C. 2357, their history is very exact. We find the names of emperors, with the length of their reigns, and an account of the troubles, revolutions, and interregnums that have happened, all set down very particularly and with great fidelity." "The Chinese historians," he says, "appear to be sincere, and to regard nothing but the truth." He then describes the burning of the books, and the restoration of literature fifty-four years after under the Emperor Wen te, who ascended the throne B.C. 179.

In this way of treating Chinese chronology, Du Halde accepts the "Book of History" as good authority. It begins with the reign of Yaou, and so does he. The fact is, however, that the ancient chronology does not rest only on the testimony of this book, but also upon views held by the astronomers of the period introduced by Wen te. They formed a chronology based on a study of the "Book of History," as the Rabbis who formed the Jewish chronology did upon a comparison of the dates contained in the Old Testament. A historical work called, from the material on which it was found written, the "Bamboo Books," also contains a system of ancient chronology; and, as it dates from the time of the Chow dynasty, before the burning of the Confucian books by the first emperor of the Tsin dynasty, introduces new elements into the general question, something in the same way as happens with the Hebrew chronology through the existence of that of the Septuagint and that of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The Han dynasty chronology became current in China, and has satisfied most native scholars down to the present time, as it did till recently European scholars.

The grounds stated by Du Halde for giving credit to the accepted native chronology are that it is very self-coherent and substantial; that it has not, like the Greek and Roman history, the air of a fiction at the beginning; that it has an important verification in a solar eclipse at a very early date; that the historians were witnesses of the events they related; that Confucius, as his words show, regarded it as deserving of confidence; and that Mencius says a thousand years elapsed between Shun and Wen wang.

Since Wen wang lived about B.C. 1100, the testimony of Mencius makes it clear that in his day—B.C. 300—the accepted chronology, as far back as to the time of the Emperor Shun, was much the same as afterwards determined by the Han scholars, and as that contained in the "Bamboo Books."

Du Halde proceeds to remark that later Chinese historians have noticed unsatisfactory points in the received chronology even of the Chow dynasty, and that at the same time they have, in accordance with the traditions retained in the "Book of Changes" and other works, classical and non-classical, commenced their narratives of the history of China with the time of Fuhe, B.C. 2852.

The reason that they have gone back nearly five hundred years was probably threefold. They wished history to embrace the great legendary personage Fuhe, who is regarded as the first Chinese emperor. They wished to honour Fuhe as the maker of the Pakwa and the author of the "Book of Changes" in its primitive form, when it was merely a collection of symbolic strokes. They wished to respect the judgment of Confucius, who, while he commenced the "Book of History" with Yaou, inserted in his supplement to the "Book of Changes" a passage commemorating the services of Fuhe, Shin nung, and Hwang te, venerated through all antiquity as the founders of the Chinese civilization.

"Anciently," says Confucius, in this passage, "Fuhe, in ruling the world, evoked to the lights of heaven, the laws of earth, the marks on birds and beasts, with the signs capable of being noted on the human body and on all material objects. He then invented the Pakwa or eight diagrams, the art of writing by means of knotted cords, and the methods to be pursued in hunting and fishing. After him came Shin nung, who taught ploughing and hoeing, marketing and trading. Houses, boats; the use of the ox and horse as beasts of burden; the art of grinding corn; the use of the bow and arrow; the introduction of coffins and burial for the dead; and the change of knotted cords into the use of a written character, soon followed; and in the time of Yaou the features of the old Chinese civilization were complete."

This view of the early growth of Chinese polity presents to us Confucius, a grave, erudite, and sober-minded sage, looking upon the third millennium before Christ as the period when his countrymen emerged from barbarism into civilization. He knew of no foreign origin to the Chinese people, nor did he regard it as necessary to assign any of the elements of their early culture to a foreign source.

Before Fuhe everything is to him a mysterious unfathomed depth. All he knows is that a succession of wise men appeared B.C. 2850 to B.C. 2350, who, one after the other, instructed the people in the useful arts, in morality, and in the philosophy of nature. No theory of creation had ever, so far as we know, been suggested to him. He had before him, to be taught and explained by his philosophy, the visible universe in a state of incessant changes. The former sages, Fuhe, Hwang te, and Wen wang, had taught a theory of transformations. It accounts for all phenomena of the world political and the world material, for man as an animal and as a social and intellectual being. This was enough.

The native view of the first beginnings of the Chinese race should be allowed. The legends that go before Fuhe do not deserve so much attention. They rest on a less respectable authority.

It is now about fifteen years since the publication of Dr. James Legge's translation of the "Book of History." He arrives at a conclusion unfavourable to its historical character. In his "Prolegomena" he represents it as half legend, and suspects that the names of many emperors were invented by subsequent writers. The Rev. J. Chalmers examined the astronomical data, and pronounced them unsatisfactory. In his dissertation, inserted after the "Prolegomena," he declares them to be wanting in all essential points. The question of the antiquity of the Chinese assumed a new shape. The credible and self-consistent history of ancient China was believed by many, from the time that this change in opinion took place, to date no earlier than B.C. 781, when the history written by Confucius commences. There can be no doubt of this historical fragment being fairly within the historical period, for authors were then rife, chronicles

were kept at the courts of kings, astronomical records were preserved, eclipses were noted; all events were chronologically arranged. The question is not, can this be accepted? but, can it be right to treat all the preceding Chinese history as half mythical? Mr. Mayers does so in his "Chinese Readers' Manual," published in 1874. The period from B.C. 2852 to 1154 he terms the legendary period. From B.C. 1154 to 781 is in his nomenclature the semi-historical period. Trustworthy history only commences, in his opinion, from B.C. 781. This mode of treating early Chinese chronology occurs in a highly useful work by a writer whose name carries with it no little authority.

An opinion very different from these writers has been recently adopted and promulgated by Dr. Gustave Schlegel. His studies in the nomenclature of the stars and the peculiarities of the Chinese zodiac have materially affected his opinions. He adopts the extraordinary view that the stars were named by the Chinese 17,000 years before the Christian era. His principal reason for this novel doctrine is that the zodiac of twenty-eight constellations commences with the bright star Spica in the sign Virgo. Dr. Schlegel thinks that the sun was in Virgo in the spring when the Chinese stars were first named, and that if he were not in that position, the ancient Chinese would not have begun the zodiac there. When the Greeks took over the Asiatic zodiac which their neighbours communicated to them, they commenced the series of twelve months with Aries. The sun in spring is now thirty degrees behind Aries. The interval represents in time two thousand years, and one twelfth of the zodiacal circle. Twelve times this number of years makes the cycle which represents the time the sun must take to run his course backward round the zodiac.

Since the time of Hipparchus and the change of the sun's place among the stars at the vernal equinox from the Ram to the Fishes, certainly the period that has elapsed seems very long, and the science of astronomy has gone through a great variety of remarkable phases. But this is quite a short term of years compared with that which has been recognized by Dr. Schlegel as having passed away since the first Chinese astronomers divided the stars into groups and gave them names. All that the Chinese themselves claim for their astronomy, is an antiquity of 4,000 years,

when the sun had just entered Taurus, being sixty degrees in front of his present position. They will be astonished when they find that, among the foreign students of their ancient books, there is one who believes that their names for stars are more than four times older, and that since the primeval mapping of the constellations, the sun has slowly travelled backward through nine signs of the zodiac to the point where he now is.

The argument of this author is expanded into two octavo* volumes, and illustrated from a rich variety of sources, Chinese and European, in the most learned manner.

The reasons against the acceptance of his hypothesis are very strong. The names of stars embrace the whole imperial *régime* of ancient China, with a multitude of details all harmonizing with what we know of the country from the classical books. The ancient ideas of the Chinese about government, their modes of naming officers and court buildings, their sacrifices, derivation of houses, agriculture, markets, and many circumstances of popular and official life, are reflected in the stellar nomenclature. We see there the old customs as they were during the time of and after Yaou and Shun. The supposition that this *régime* should have lasted in the same form through nearly twenty millenniums seems very unreasonable, and contrary to the lesson derived by history from the past of every other country, that incessant change is the law of all human affairs.

This author has made a careful study (and he is probably the only European who has done so) of the old Chinese astrology. In books written about 2,000 years ago, the stars are described with a great multiplicity of lucky and unlucky indications. The classics are several centuries older, and the astrological indications are not found in them. Yet the classics speak in such a way that both magic and astrology must have existed. To say, however, as Dr. Schlegel does, that the identical astrology which is contained in books of the Han dynasty still extant, was a prime element in the knowledge of those who made the names of the stars,

* "Uranographie Chinoise." Printed at the expense of the Royal Dutch Institute for Ethnology, Philology, and Geography, 1875.

and that it existed in their day in much the same form as at the court of the emperors of the early Han dynasty, is to maintain the incredible, and to invite adverse criticism.

It is marvellous that a man of great ingenuity and learning should originate a hypothesis so difficult to defend. In justice to the author, let me here mention what appears to me one of his most plausible arguments.

Among the twenty-eight groups of stars which constitute the Chinese zodiac, and roughly represent the place of the moon every day in one lunation, are the two well-known and beautiful constellations called by the Greeks, Pleiades and Hyades, the latter so named because its appearance indicated the arrival of the rainy season. In China the Hyades are called Pi, and in the "Book of History," the most important of the classics, Pi is called the "Ruler of Rain." Schlegel says, that since Pi was, in the time of the "Book of History," a spring constellation, as it is in Greek astronomy, it could not have been called the ruler of rain because it then indicated the rainy season, the spring of North China being dry. It must have been so named, he thinks, at that immensely ancient date when it was an autumn constellation, the sun having had time to travel, in the interim, through more than half the zodiac.

The coincidence is certainly most remarkable that the Hyades should rule the rain in both Greece and China. To explain this coincidence without the hypothesis of Dr. Schlegel is perhaps, not impossible, though beset with difficulties. But it should be remembered that about the Mediterranean Sea, spring is rainy and autumn fair, while in China the reverse is the case. Let it then rather be supposed that the Hyades were named first in Western countries, and communicated, in some manner unknown, to China while the "Book of History" was being written; or let it be supposed that the Greek word Hyades meant originally, as some say, "the little pigs," and that the coincidence is accidental.

Dr. Schlegel has felt encouraged to adopt the extravagant opinion that the Chinese names of stars were made seventeen thousand years ago, by the speculations of writers favourable to the Darwinian account of the origin of man. Between the

dawn of humanity and the dawn of history a vast chasm yawns. Some Darwinians say that men were cannibals for many millenniums before they became civilized. Others say they were without articulate speech for many millenniums, and that they became separated into great families before they attained the power to express themselves in words. Our author thinks he has found in the zodiac of China a safe basis for a theory which extends the history of that country back to a time which agrees with the requirements of Darwinian writers, and might lend support to the most incredibly ancient of the Egyptian dynasties.

The Chinese themselves, however, do not thus read their old records, nor has any foreign student of Chinese yet come forward to announce his conversion to this author's view.

But while early Chinese history cannot lend much aid to views now current on the antiquity of the human race, it seems to indicate the need of a longer Scripture chronology than satisfied the theologians of other days. To allow for the natural development of language, and of the difference found to exist between races in the various climates of our globes, we may require an age for the human race considerably more lengthened than that which Archbishop Usher adopted.

Yet there is nothing in the Chinese classics which demands a longer period for the presence of the Chinese in their own country than 2,800 years.

INDEX.

Abimael unknown, 248.
Abydos, the Tables of, 153.
Abyssinia=Cush, 193.
Accad, 39, 211.
Achæan, term unknown in Asia, [173.
Achæmenian times, the, 105.
Aches, king, 222.
Achilles, the prize of, 52.
Achish, 221. [tion, 9.
Adam and Eve, Milton's descrip-
Æolians=Elishah, 184.
Africans burrowing, 10.
Agadi, kingdom of, 39.
Agau language, 209.
Agron not real, 74.
Alban list of kings, 25.
Almodad=El Mudad, 247.
Alphabetic writing, invention of, [59.
Alyattes, tomb of, 76, 140.
Amazons and Phrygians, 67.
Amenephthes, 222.
American civilization, degradation [of, 5.
Amorites, 197, 225.
Amraphel, 231.
Amun-m-he, 29.
Anacreon on the Lydians, 78.
Anamim not identified, 217.
Anu, 217.
Apachnas, 221.
Aphar, 249.
Apis, 22.
Apis Stelæ, 22.
Apollo worshipped by Celts, 145.
Apophis, 221, 222.
Arab civilization, 3.
Arabian period in Babylon, 38, 40.
Arabians, characteristics of, 250.
Arabic languages, 209.
Aram=Syria, 234.
Aramæan literature, 235.
Aramæans represented by modern Nestorians or Chaldees, 235.
Arapcha or Arapka, 232.
Arca, 200.
Archilochus contemporary with [Gyges, 72.
Ard-el-Huleh, 242.
Argive list of kings, 24.
Argos, Phœnician trade with, 51.
Arioch, king, identification of, 39.
Armah=Armenia, 182.
Armenians=Togarmah, 183.
Arpachshad, 232.
Arphaxad, unknown, 232.
Arrapachitis, 232.
Artaxerxes, 230.
Artemis, temple of, 104.
Arvad, 200.
Aryan art, 85.
  civilization, 85.
  king, the first, 11.
Aryanem vaejo, 11.
Ascalon, founding of, 71.
Ascanius, lakes, 181.
Ashkenaz, 181.
Asia Minor, date of civilization, [161.
Asies, the hero, 74.
Asses, 221.
Asshur=Assyria, 231.
Asshur-bani-pal, annals of, 37.
Assyria=Asshur, 231.
  date of rise of, 161.
  and Lydia, supposed connection between, 73.
Assyrian architecture, 90.
  brick-enameling, 95.

Assyrian carving, 95.
chronology, 88.
colossi, weight of, 143.
cruelty, 96.
cuneiform records, 89.
embroidery, 95.
empire, commencement of, 87.
engineering, 90.
engraving, 95.
furniture, 95.
glass blowing, 95.
glyptic art, 91.
influence, extent of, 73.
language, 238.
list of kings, 24.
metallurgy, 95.
modelling, 95.
patesi, or viceroys, 89.
physiognomy, 239.
sculptures, 92.
superstition, 96.
syllabarium, 100.
Asta-sobas, river, 205.
Athené, queen of Attica, 40.
temple of, 104.
Athenian list of kings, 24.
Athothis, king, 13, 222.
Atramitæ, 206.
Atys, the god, 74.
Auzara or Ausara=Uzal, 248.
Avebury, Monuments at, 139.

Baalbek, 202.
Babel, 211.
Babylon, a seat of empire, 40.
Arab period in, 40.
Arabian dynasty of, 38.
date of Assyrian conquest, 38
date of monarchy in, 161.
Elamitic period in, 40.
origines of, 41.
Semitic period in, 39.
Sennacherib's recovery of, 38.
Turanian period in, 40.
Babylonia, Elamitic invasion of, 37.
Babylonian and Egyptian writing compared, 59.
and Susianian words, 213.
architecture, 42.
Babylonian chronology, 15.
civilization, 14, 41.
coffins, 45.
cylinder seats, 14.
engraving, 15, 45.
implements, 43.
inscriptions, 45.
kingdom first set up, 34.
monuments, 12.
pottery, 44.
weaving, 45.
writing, 15, 45.
Bactrians, origin of the civilization of, 96.
Bahr-el-Huleh, 242.
Ball, game of, invented, 75.
Bazu and Kazu=Buz and Uz or Huz, 241.
Behistun, remains at, 100.
Beisán, 202.
Belus, supposed son of, 73.
Beni-es-Silfan=Sheleph, 247.
Berber words, 223.
Berbers=Marmaridæ, 223.
and Tuariks=Lehabim, 217.
Berosus and monuments, comparison between, 41.
dynasties of, 36.
Beth-shan, 202.
Bithynians, the, 174.
Bnon, 221.
Brahmana period, the, 107.
Briges, the, 174.
congeners of Phrygians, 67.
Britain, natives of, 134.
British Celts, civilization of (*see* Celts).
Britons, civilization of, 133.
Brute, the Trojan, 74.
Buccinum lapillus, 57.
Buzites, 241.

Cabales=Cabyles, 223.
Cæcinæ, tomb of the, 119.
Cære, vault at, 117.
Cæsarea Mazaca, 173.
Cæsar's account of Britons, 134.
Calbis, valley of the, 79.
Calneh, or Calno, 211.

Cambri, or Cambria, 170.
Canaan, 196.
subdivision of, 215.
Canaanite names, Semitic, 201.
Canaanites, character of, 200.
language of, 199.
Caphtor, isle of, 220.
Caphtorim=Copts, 220.
Cappadocians, 244.
Carmania, 208.
Casius, Mount, inhabitants of, 219.
Casluhim, unknown, 219.
Cataracta, 115.
Caunians, a branch of Lycians, 82.
Celtes, 141.
Celtic archæology, 138.
civilization, character of, 145.
cromlechs, 140.
engineering, 142.
mechanical ingenuity, 142.
ornaments, 141.
pottery, 140.
tools, 141.
weapons, 141.
Celts, British, civilization of, commencement of, 132.
described by Cæsar, Diodorus, Strabo, and Tacitus, 134.
Gallic, civilization of, 145.
pre-Roman, 139.
Cervetri, tomb at, 119.
vault at, 117.
Ceylon, civilization of, 7.
Chaldæa, language of, 212. [213.
Chaldæan and Egyptian writing, era, 35.
kingdom, establishment of, 34.
Chaldees remant of Aramæans, 235.
Chandas period, the, 107.
Chardak, lake, 181.
Chattramitæ=Hazarmaveth, 248.
Chedor-Laomer, king, 39, 231.
Chehl Minar, the, 102.
Chinese, antiquity of the, 268.
Chittim, or Kittim, 185.
Chiusi, tomb at, 119.
Chronological agreement, 147.
conclusions, 161.
Chronology, authorized, 16.
Cilicia, colonization of, 185.
Cimbri, 170.
City, the first, 10.
Civilization of various nations, dates of, 147.
Cloaca Maxima, the, 116.
Coins of Græco-Bactrians, 4.
Colchians, 219.
Comparative philosophy, 6.
Copper, smelting of, 10.
Coptic words, 223.
Copts, modern origin of, 5.
Corinthian list of kings, 25.
Cossæans=Kissians, 231.
Cotyæum, tomb near, 69.
Cotys, the god, 74.
Crœsus, conquest of, by Cyrus, court of, 78.
Cromlechs, 140.
Ctesias, ill-faith of, 88.
lists of, 24.
on the founding of Nineveh, 87.
Cuneiform records, Assyrian, 89.
writing, 15.
Cush=Ethiopia, or Abyssinia, 192.
and Mizraim akin, 203.
Asiatic, 193.
subdivisions of, 204.
Cushite geography, 208.
language, 208.
Cylinder-seals, Babylonian, 14.
Cymric races, three, 190.
Cypriot language, 187.
remains later than Lycian, 80.
Cypriots perhaps a link between Assyrians and Lycians, 80.
Cyprus, Greeks of, 173.
people of=Chittim, or Kittim,
Cyrenaica, 217. [185
Cyrus, conquest of Crœsus by, 79.
conquest of Lydia by, 70.

Daci, ancestors of Danes, 178.
Dacian colonists of Trajan, 5.
Dactyli of Mount Ida, 68.
Dadan, island of, 207.
Danes descended from Daci, 178.
Darius Hystaspis, 230.
contemporary with Zoroaster, 97.

Darius, first satrapy of. 79
Dedan, 207.
Delphi, Gygian offerings to, 72.
Deluge, date of, 32, 161.
Dialects, mother, sister, and daughter, 190.
Diana, temple of, at Ephesus, 104.
Dice invented by Lydians, 75.
Diklah=Dakalah, 248.
Diphath=Riphath, 182.
Divinity of Egyptian kings, 22.
Dodanim, or Rodanim=Rhodians, 187.
Doganlu, tomb of Midas at, 69.
Domesday book of Hebrews, 64.
Dorian, term unknown in Asia, 173.
Druids, the, 135.
  circles of, 139, 142.
Dungi, signet cylinder of, 46.

Ebal=Obal, 249.
Eber, children of, 229.
Ecbatana, remains at, 100
Edomites, 241.
Egypt, date of monarchy in, 161.
  dynasties of, 159. [59.
Egyptian and Babylonian writing, and Chaldean writing, 213.
  ancient, language, 198.
  chronology, 15.
    difficulties of, 154.
    discussed, 149.
    summary of, 159.
    want of, 23.
  civilization, 13, 17.
    Prof. Owen on antiquity of, 255.
  dynasties, 23, 26.
  monuments, 12.
Egyptians=Mizraim.
Egypts, the two, 167.
El Mudad=Almodad, 247.
Elam, 229.
Elamitic period in Babylon, 40.
Elishah=Æolians, 184.
Ellasar, kingdom of, 39.
Elymæans, 231.
Elymaïs, 230.
Enentef, 29.
Ephraem Syrus, 235.
Erech=Orchoë, Orech, Warka or Irka, 211.
  kingdom of, 39.
Eridu, a seat of empire, 40.
Esarhaddon, 232.
Es-Sulaf or Beni-es-Silfan=Sheleph, 247.
Eshmunazar, sarcophagus of, 55.
Ethiopia=Cush, 192.
Ethiopian, ancient, language, 199.
Ethiopians and Saites contemporary, 24.
Etruria the source of Roman civilization, 110.
Etruscan architecture, 114.
  astronomy, 131.
  banquets, 127.
  bas-reliefs, 120.
  bridges, 116.
  bronzes, 122.
  candelabra, 123.
  civilization, 111, 161.
  cruelty, 130.
  diviners, 127.
  drama, 130.
  engineering, 130.
  engraved mirrors, 124.
  fictile art, 124.
  gate-ways, 115.
  government, 128.
  literature, 160.
  luxury, 126.
  medicine, 131.
  meteorology, 131.
  modelling, 125.
  morality, 129.
  music, 126.
  painting, 119, 121.
  religion, 127.
  remains, 113.
  science, 130.
  sculpture in tombs, 119.
  sewers, 116.
  statuary, 120.
  tombs, 118.
  towers, 115.
  vases, 113, 124.
  vaults, 117.

Eulæus, river, 230.
Euphrates, 235.
Evolution, doctrine of, 2.

Firdausi, great work of, 105.
Flint flakes, 32.
Flute, invention of, 10.

Galla language, 209.
Gallic Celts, civilization of, 145.
Gâthas, 98.
  resemblance between the Rig-Veda and the, 106.
Gaulanitis, 242.
Gebanitæ, 248.
Geloni, 4.
Genealogies, Scripture, 165.
Germans=Tiras, 177.
Getæ, ancestors of Goths, 178.
Gether unknown, 242.
Gimiri, 170.
Girgashites, 197.
Glass known in Egypt at the Pyramid period, 56.
Glass-making, invention of, 56.
Gog probably Scythians, 171.
Golden age, the, 11.
Gomer, 169.
  represents the Celts, 171.
Gordias, founder of Phrygian kingdom, 70.
Goths, descended from Getæ, 178.
Græco-Bactrian people, 4.
Græco-Italians=Javan, 177.
Great Zidon, mention of, 64.
Grecian first age, 11.
Greek civilization, 3.
  races, four, 190.
  the term unknown in Asia, 173,
Grotto del Triclinio, 119. [72.
Gyges, son of Dascylus, 70.
  contemporary with Archilochus, mentioned by Sardanapalus, 72.
Gygian offerings to Delphi, 72.

Hadoram, 248.
Hadramaut = Hazarmaveth, 206, 247.
Har-Hat-her, 218.
Haïkian race, the, 183.
Hamadan, remains at, 100.
Hamathites, 224.
Hamitic languages, 197.
  races, chief, 192.
    geography of, 197.
Harp, invention of, 10.
Harpagus, satrap of Lycia, 79.
Harpy tomb, the, 81.
Havilah=Khawlán, 206, 250.
Hazarmaveth=Hadramaut, Chatramotitæ, Chattramitæ, Atramitæ, 247.
Heber, children of, 229
Hebrew language, 237.
Hecuba, offering of, 52.
Hellene, the term unknown in Asia, 173.
Hellenic civilization, date of, 161.
Hephæstus, bowl of, 52.
Heracleid kings, supposed genealogy of, 73.
Heracleids, the, 70. [158.
Herodotus and Manetho compared,
Hezekiah contemporary with Midas, 69.
Hiddekel=Tigris, 232.
Himyaric language, 209.
Hiram, artistic works of, 53.
Hissar-lik, remains at, 84.
Hittites, 197.
Hivites, 197.
Homeric poems, date of, 50.
Horestii, the, 138. [75.
Huckle-bones invented by Lydians,
Hul unknown, 242.
Huz or Uz=Khazu, 241.
Hyksos, 213.

Iafon-es or Ionians, 172.
Ideographs, 59.
Ignatius's Epistles, 235.
Ilgi, signet cylinder of, 46.
Indic civilization, 106, 161.
Indo-Persians=Madai, 177.
Ionians identified with Javan, 172.
Iranian cruelty, 105.
  cultivation, 100.
  manners, 105.
  remains, 100.

Iranic agriculture, 98.
architecture, 101.
civilization, 96, 161.
corruption, 105.
decoration, 103.
inscriptions, 104.
poetry, 99.
religion, 99.
sculpture, 102.
Iranic writing, 100.
Irka=Erech or Orech, 211.
Iron, smelting of, 10.
Ishbi-Benob, 221.
Isle of Roses, 188.
Istakr, remains at, 100.
Iznik, lake of, 181.

Jachin and Boaz, the pillars, 53.
Jambres, 222.
Jannas, 221.
Jannes, 222.
Japhetic races, chief, 165, 175.
geographical limits of, 191.
Jaulán, 242.
Javan=Græco-Italians, 177.
identified with Ionians, 172.
Jebel Shomer, 241.
Jebusites, 197.
Jemshid, 11.
Jeoud, 49.
Jerah=Yerákh, 248.
Jews of post-Babylonian period, 5.
Jobab uncertain, 250.
Jobabitæ, 250.
Jobarite, 250.
Joktan=Arabs, 246.
Jordan, plain of, 53.
Jurhum, 247.

Kahtan=Joktan, 246.
Karrak, kingdom of, 39.
Kazu=Uz or Huz, 241.
Kebt-hor, 220.
Keft, 220.
Khabour, 234.
Khammurabi, king, 38.
Khawlán=Havilah, 206.
Khem or Khemi, 194.
Kimiri or Kimmerii, 170.
Kissia, 231.
Kissians=Cossæans, 231.
Kitieis, 185.
Kition, 185.
Kittiæans, 185.
Kittim or Chittim=people of Cyprus, 185.
Kronos, king, 49.
Kudur-Lagamar, king, 39.
Kudur-Mabuk, king, 39.
Kuft, 220.

La Mercareccia, the tomb, 119.
Larsa, kingdom of, 39.
Lebu=Lehabim, Lubim, Rebu, and Libyans, 217.
Lectionary, new, 165.
Lehabim=Lubim, Rebu or Lebu, Tuariks, Berbers, and Libyans, 217.
Libya, 217.
Libyans=Lehabim, Lubim, Rebu, and Lebu, 217.
Long chronology, 150.
Lubim,=Lehabim, Rebu, Lebu, and Libyans, 217.
Lucumones, the, 128.
Lud uncertain, 233.
Luden=Ruten, 234.
Ludim not Lydians, 216.
Lycia conquered by Harpagus, 79.
geography of, 79.
Lycian architecture, 79.
civilization, date of, 161.
dress, 81.
furniture, 81.
genealogies, 81.
glyptic art, 79.
inscriptions, 80.
sculptures, 80.
tombs, 80.
women, position of, 81.
Lydia and Assyria, supposed connection between, 73.
conquest of, by Cyrus, 70.
Lydian barrow, 76.
civilization, date of, 77, 161.
chronology, 72.
coined money, 74.
command of Mediterranean, 71.

Lydian commerce, 74.
dynasties, 70.
first dynasty mythical, 74.
games, 75.
glyptic art, 75.
history, beginning of, 74.
kingdom, antiquity of, 71.
kings, tombs of, 77.
luxury, 78.
mason-work, 75.
music, 75.
Pantheon, 74.
remains, grandeur of, 76.
shipbuilding, 75.
tumulus, 76.
Lydians identical with Mêones, 71.
Lydus, son of Atys, 70, 74. [58.
Lyro-phœnix, or lyro-phœnikion,

Macedonian lists of kings, 24.
Madai identified with Medes, 172.
Madai=Indo-Persians, 177.
Mæatæ, the, 138.
Mæones, *heros* of the, 74.
Mæsi, the, 174.
Magnesia, 187.
Magog = Slaves, 177.
probably Scythians, 171.
Mahra, 248.
Mahras, language of, 209.
Manes, 74. [158.
Manetho and Herodotus compared, compared with other authorities, dynasties of, 155. [155.
scheme of, 159.
the history of, 23.
Mantra period, the, 107.
Mariandynians, the, 174.
Marmaridæ = Berbers, 223.
Mash = Meshech, 242.
Medes identified with Madai, 172.
migration of, 99.
origin of civilization of, 96.
Median dynasty, 35.
list of kings, 24. [50.
Mediterranean a Phœnician lake,
Meles, ideal founder of Lydian capital, 74.
Melkarth, temple of, 63.
Memphis, temple of Phthah at, 13.
Memphites contemporary with Thinites, 24.
Menephthah, 222.
Menes, first king of Egypt, 13, 19.
dates for accession of, 21.
Menkera, contemporaries of, 28.
Mên, king, 19.
Mêones, *heros* of the, 74.
represent Lydians, 71.
Mermnads, the, 70.
Meroë, 205.
Meshech = Mash, 242.
represents the Moschi, 173.
Mesopotamia, civilization in, 34.
Lower, monarchy of, 212.
Mexican civilization, 5.
golden age, 11.
Midas possibly Mita, 69.
contemporary with Hezekiah, 69.
M'na, king, 19.
Mosaic ethnology, obscurity, 180.
Moschi founders of Moscow, 179.
represented by Meshech, 173.
Moses of Chorênë, history of, 183.
Mudad = Almodad, 247.
Muntopt I., 29.
Muntopt, II., 29.
Murex trunculus, 57.
Murghab, remains at, 100.
Muscovites descended from Moschi,
Muskai, the, 173. [179.
Milton's description of our first parents, 9.
Minæi, 248.
Minerva, temple of, 104.
Mita possibly Midas, 69.
Mizraim = Egyptians, 194.
and Cush akin, 203.
subdivisions of, 215.
Mizraïtes, 219.

Nabopolassar, revolt of, 38.
Nakhsh-i-Rustam, remains at, 100.
Na-Petu, 218.
Naphtuhim uncertain, 218.
Nebuchadnezzar, people of, 235.
Nehemiah, 230.

Nestorians, remnant of Aramæans, 235.
Nicolas of Damascus, list of kings preserved by, 72.
Nile, course of, changed, 13.
Nimrod, 210. [36.
  and Noah, generations between,
Nimrod's kingdom, date of, 37.
Nimrud, vessels found at, 55.
Nineveh, founding of, 87.
Ninus of the Greeks, the, 89.
  founder of Nineveh, 87.
  supposed son of, 73.
Niphaiat, 218.
Noah and Nimrod, generations between, 36.
Norchia, temple-tombs at, 118.
Nubians, language of, 202.

Obal unknown, 248.
Ophir = Saphar or Zaphar, 249.
Orchoë = Erech, 211.
Orech = Erech, Irka, Warka, Orchoë, 211.
Origines, frequent fallacy of, 6.
  of Babylon, 41.
Osiris, 48.
Osirkef, contemporaries of, 28.
Ottadini, the, 138.
Owen, Prof., on antiquity of Egyptian civilization, 255.

Pactolus, sands of, 74.
Palæolithic period and early Egyptian civilization contemporaneous, 32.
Paphlagonians, the 174.
Parthians, 226.
Pasargadæ, remains at, 100.
Patesi, 89.
Pathros, 218.
Pathrusim, 218.
Patrocles, funeral of, 52.
Peleg, 245.
Peloponnese, the trade with, 51.
Pepi, 222.
Periplus, 249.
Perizzites, 197.
Persepolis, remains at, 100.
Persian poets, 105.
Persians, civilization of, 96.
Peruvian children of the sun, 11.
  civilization, 5.
Peshito Bible, 235.
Pet = Nubians, 196.
Phæacians, 50.
Phædimus, bowl of, 52.
Pha-Hat-her, 218.
Phathros, 219.
Phaturite nome, the, 218.
Philistim = Caphtorim, 219.
  = Philistines, 219.
Philistine names, 221.
Philo of Byblos, 48.
Phœnicia, date of rise of, 161.
Phœnician architecture, 55.
  arts, 52.
  civilization, 48, 62.
  colour, the, 57.
  commerce, 51.
  dyeing, 56.
  embroidery, 53.
  glass, 56.
  glyptic or plastic art, 55.
  metallurgy, 53, 55.
  music, 56.
  nautical skill, 51.
  remains, 55.
  slave-dealers, 51.
  trade with Peloponnese, 51.
    with Argos, 51.
  writing, 59.
Phœnix or phœnikeos, 57.
Phrygia, geography of, 66.
Phrygian boxing, 68.
  civilization, character of, 68.
    date of, 69, 161.
  courage, 68.
  immigration, 67.
  kingdom, date of, 70.
  music, 68.
  odes and hymns, 69.
  sculptured rock tombs, 68.
  seamanship, 68.
Phrygians autochthones, 67.
Phthah, temple of, 13.
Phut = Nubia, 194.
  language of, 202.

Polypaipaloi, the epithet, 50.
Populonia, remains at, 114.
Porta all' Arco, the, 116.
di Diana, the, 116.
Prehistoric man, 8.
Priam and the Phrygians, 67.
Mêones assist, 71.
Primeval man, 8.
savage, 1.
Pul, reign of, 35, 37, 88.
Put = Phut, 196.
Pyramid kings, reigns of, 156.
period, the, 13.
pictures of the, 14.

Ra, the god, 213.
Raamah, 206.
Rebu = Lehabim, Lubim, Lebu, and Libyans, 217.
Regulini-Galassi vault, the, 117.
Rhodians = Rodanim or Dodanim, [187.
Rhodii, 187.
Rhyta, 125.
Ri-agu, king, 39.
Rig-Veda, hymns of the, 106.
Rim-agu, king, 39.
Riphath=Diphath, 182.
Rock-sculpture in Lydia, 75.
Rodanim or Dodanim = Rhodians, [187.
Roman civilization, 3.
Rosetta Stone, the, 198.
Roumans of Wallachia, origin of, 5.
Rusellæ, remains at, 114.
Russian civilization, 4.
Ruten, 234.

Saba or Seba, 205.
Sabæans = Seba, 205.
Sabbatha = Sabtah, 206.
Sabtechah, 207.
Sabota = Sabtah, 206.
Sabtah = Sabbatha, 206.
Saites and Ethiopians contemporary, 24.
Sakkarah, the Table of, 153.
Salah, 245.
Salapeni = Sheleph, 247.
Salatis, 221.
Sälfie = Sheleph, or Salapeni, 247.
Samidacé, 207.
Samshu-iluna, king, 39.
Saná = Uzal, 248.
Sanchoniathon, 48.
Sanskritic Aryans, 7.
Saph, 221.
Saphar = Ophir, 249.
Sapphara, 249.
Sarcostema viminalis, 99.
Sarmatians allied to Scyths, 177.
Sauromatæ allied to Scyths, 177.
Scamander, civilization on banks of, 82.
Scandia, 182.
Scandinavia, 182.
Schliemann, Dr. discoveries of, 13, 82.
Scythians probably Magog, 171.
Scyths allied to Sauromatæ, or Sarmatians, 177.
Seba or Saba = Sabæans, 205.
Sebennytus, priest of, 23.
Semites, 207.
Semitic period in Babylon, 39.
races, the, 228.
geography of, 252.
subdivisions of, 240.
Sennacherib, 232.
Sennacherib's colonization of Cilicia, 185.
recovery of Babylon, 38.
Serapeum, the, 152.
Shafré, contemporaries of, 28.
Shamanism, 127.
Shayretana, 222.
Sheba = Sabæans, 206, 249.
Sheleph = Salapeni, Es-Sulaf or Beni-es-Silfan, 247.
Shem, children of, 228.
Shepherd conquest of Egypt, 30.
dynasties, 27.
Shinar, 211.
Shufu, contemporaries of, 28.
Shuluh words, 223.
Shuluhs, 223.
Shuré, contemporaries of, 28.
Shushan, the palace, 230.
Sicyonian list of kings, 24.

Sidon, 200, 225.
  date of foundation of, 51, 63.
Simoïs, the, 83.
Simyra, 200.
Sipylus, 187.
Slaves = Magog, 177.
Soris, contemporaries of, 28.
Stonehenge, 139.
Strabo's account of Britons, 135.
Succoth, 53.
Suphis, 222.
Susa, 103, 230.
Susianian and Babylonian words, 213.
Susis, 231.
Sutra period, the, 107.
Syria = Aram, 234.
Syriac Bible, 235.
  language, 237.

Taautus, 48.
Table of Sakkarah, the, 153.
Tables of Abydos, the, 153.
Tacitus' account of the Britons, 136.
Tarquins, tomb of the, 119.
Tarshish = Tarsus in Cilicia, 184.
Telemachus, gifts to, 52.
Temple-tombs, 118.
Tent, invention of, 10.
Teutons = Tiras, 177.
Tezeuco, golden age of, 11.
Thinites contemporary with Memphites, 24.
Thorgau, 183.
Thoth, 222.
  claimed to be Phœnician, 48.
Thracian words, 178.
Thracians probably Tiras, 174.
Thynians, the, 174.
Tidareni, represented by Tubal, 173.
Tiglath-Pileser, 37.
Tiglathi-Nin, conqueror of Mesopotamia, 97.
Tigris = Hiddekel, 232.
Tiras = Teutons or Germans, 177.
  probably Thracians, 174.
Tirkhak, 213.
Titicaca, Lake, community on, 11.
Tmolus, Mount, Mêones from, 71.
  mines of, 74.
Togarmah = Armenians, 182.
Tokkaru, 222.
Tomb of Alyattes, 76.
  of Zala, the, 82.
  of the Cæcinæ, 119.
  of the Tarquins, 119.
Tosorthmus, king, 13.
Triads, the, 133.
Troad, barrows of, 76.
Trojan masonry, 83.
  metallurgy, 83.
  ornaments, 83.
  pottery, 83.
  War, date of, 51, 87.
  whorls, 84.
Trôktai, the epithet, 50.
Troy, capture of, date of, 63, 149.
  civilization at, 83.
  inscriptions found at, 82.
Tuarik words, 223.
Tuariks and Berbers = Lehabim, 217.
Tubal represents the Tibareni, 173.
Tuplai, the 173.
Turanian monarchy, 34.
  period in Babylon, 40.
Turin papyrus, the, 152.
Turkish civilization, 4.
Tyre, date of foundation of, 63.
Tyrian purple, 57.
Tyrrhenians, the, 112.

Ulai, river, 230.
Ur, kingdom of, 30.
Urukh, cylinders of, 15, 46.
Useskef, contemporaries of, 28.
Uz or Huz = Khazu, 241.
Uzal = Saná, Auzara, Ausara, 248.

Vedas, the, date of, 106.
Vedic composition, four periods of, 107.
Volaterræ, remains at, 114, 169.
Vulci, bridge at, 117.

Wallachia, Roumans of, origin of, 5.
Warka = Erech or Orech, 211.
Weddas, the, 7.
Welsh, 170.

Writing, spread of, 62.

Xanthus, Lydian historian, 71.
  valley of the, 79.
Xerxes, 230.
  great hall of, 102.

Yacut, 247.
Yavnan or Greeks of Cyprus, 173.
Yemen, 247.
Yerákh = Jerah, 248.
Yima, Khshaeta, 11.

Zala, the tomb of, 82.
Zaphor = Ophir, 249.
Zarthan, 53.
Zemara, 200.
Zendavesta, date of, 98.
Zerghul, a seat of Empire, 40.
Zimira, 200.
Zoroaster, 97.

NEW, REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION OF

DR. SCHLIEMANN'S GREAT WORK.

DISCOVERIES AND RESEARCHES ON THE SITES OF ANCIENT MYCENÆ AND TIRYNS.

By DR. HENRY SCHLIEMANN, Author of "Troy and its Remains."

With Preface by the Hon. W. E. Gladstone.

***With** Maps, Colored Plates, Views and Cuts, representing several **Hundred** Objects of Antiquity discovered on the Sites.*

[IN ALL, FIVE HUNDRED ILLUSTRATIONS.]

CRITICAL NOTICES.

"In this magnificent volume we have finally the story of Dr. Schliemann's last and most important discoveries. He has been the most fortunate of archæological explorers; for even a greater luck than rewarded him in the Troad has fallen to his portion in Argolis. * * * We suspect that the final verdict of scholars will be that Dr. Schliemann has actually discovered the remains of the man, some part of whose history, at least, is preserved in the Agamemnon of Homer and Æschylus."—*The N. Y. Tribune.*

"Dr. Schliemann's book is worth all the prolegomens and commentaries upon Homer that have been written since the revival of learning."—*The Boston Globe.*

"The interest of the work is not confined to either England or America. Every enlightened nation will welcome it, for it opens up a new world to the modern generation. No work of the time has attracted wider attention."—*Boston Post.*

"This splendid volume is a museum of itself which every lover of history and classical literature will feel that he must possess, and which any intelligent reader is competent to understand and enjoy by means of its abundant and truly splendid illustrations."—*Buffalo Commercial Advertiser.*

"Dr. Schliemann has made the most important contribution of the present century to Greek archæology."—*The Nation.*

"We commend the volume, with its admirable typography and multitudinous illustrations, to the attention of our readers, assuring them that they will find it possessed of a rare and enduring interest."—*Boston Journal.*

"We add our testimony in saying that a copy of Mycenæ is necessary to the library of every scholar, and—which is no mean praise—that the printing and illustrations of this work are worthy of the matter."—*Baltimore Gazette.*

One vol. quarto, superbly printed on superfine paper, cloth extra, $7.50.

**** *The above books for sale by all booksellers, or will be sent, post or express charges paid, upon receipt of the price by the publishers,*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

KLUNZINGER'S

UPPER EGYPT:

ITS PEOPLE AND ITS PRODUCTS.

A DESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNT

OF THE

Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Occupations of the People of the Nile Valley, the Desert, and the Red Sea Coast, with Sketches of the Natural History and Geology.

By C. B. KLUNZINGER, M.D.,

Formerly Egyptian Sanitary Physician at Koseir, on the Red Sea.

One Volume, 8vo, Illustrated, cloth. Price, $3.00

NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

"A work of great value, a most interesting accumulation of facts, and such a description of the actual manners and customs of the Egyptians as is to be found nowhere else. . . . . Dr. Schliemann calls it the 'Baedeker' of Egypt, and the epithet is not undeserved."—*North American Review.*

"A book of decided value and great interest."—*Hartford Courant.*

"A solid, unique, and trustworthy work."—*Springfield Republican.*

"The book is one that will be amply pleasing to the popular taste, and at the same time will give to those who read for a more solid purpose than entertainment, a remarkably close acquaintance with the land of the Nile."—*Boston Journal.*

"From first to last there is not a line of what might be called dry reading, though everything is described with photographic accuracy. Indeed, so strong is the realism of the pictures which he gives us of Life in Upper Egypt, that the reader must, for the time, feel that he is a fellow-traveler with the author, instead of an humble beneficiary of of his researches."—*Baltimore Gazette.*

"The book, although presented in the truthful form of a personal narrative of incidents of life and travel, possesses the interest of a romance presented in a series of word pictures which are as fascinating as they are instructive to the reader."—*New York Commercial Advertiser.*

"The reader is not wearied with any second-hand descriptions of scenery, or with figures and plans culled from the useful pages of cyclopedias; but he is given a vivid and picturesque account of a historically interesting people, and of a land that even yet is too imperfectly known."—*Boston Sat. Eve. Gazette.*

*** *The above book for sale by all booksellers, or will be sent, post or express charges paid, upon receipt of the price by the publishers,*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

"These volumes contain the ripe results of the studies of men who are authorities in their respective fields."—THE NATION.

Epochs of Modern History.

Each 1 vol. 16mo., with Outline Maps. Price per volume, in cloth, $1.00.

EACH VOLUME COMPLETE IN ITSELF AND SOLD SEPARATELY.

EDITED BY EDWARD E. MORRIS, M.A.

The ERA of the PROTESTANT REVOLUTION. By F. SEEBOHM. Author of "The Oxford Reformers—Colet, Erasmus, More."

The CRUSADES. By the Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A., Author of the "History of Greece."

The THIRTY YEARS' WAR, 1618—1648. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER.

The HOUSES of LANCASTER and YORK; with the CONQUEST and LOSS of FRANCE. By JAMES GAIRDNER, of the Public Record Office.

The FRENCH REVOLUTION and FIRST EMPIRE; an Historical Sketch. By WM. O'CONNOR MORRIS, with an Appendix by Hon. ANDREW D. WHITE, Prest. of Cornell University.

The AGE OF ELIZABETH. By the Rev. M. CREIGHTON, M.A.

The PURITAN REVOLUTION. By J. LANGTON SANFORD.

The FALL of the STUARTS; and WESTERN EUROPE from 1678 to 1697. By the Rev. EDWARD HALE, M.A., Assist. Master at Eton.

The EARLY PLANTAGENETS and their relation to the HISTORY of EUROPE; the foundation and growth of CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT. By the Rev. WM. STUBBS, M.A., etc., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.

The BEGINNING of the MIDDLE AGES; CHARLES the GREAT and ALFRED; the HISTORY of ENGLAND in its connection with that of EUROPE in the NINTH CENTURY. By the Very Rev R. W. CHURCH, M.A., Dean of St. Paul's.

The AGE of ANNE. By EDWARD E. MORRIS, M.A., Editor of the Series.

The NORMANS IN EUROPE. By the Rev. A. H. JOHNSON, M. A.

The above Twelve Volumes in Roxburgh Style, Leather Labels and Gilt Top. Put up in a handsome Box. Sold only in Sets. Price per Set, $12.00.

FREDERICK the GREAT and the SEVEN YEARS' WAR. By F. W. LONGMAN, of Ballic College, Oxford.

*** *The above book for sale by all booksellers, or will be sent, post or express charges paid, upon receipt of the price by the publishers.*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Now in process of publication, uniform with EPOCHS OF MODERN HISTORY, *each volume in 12mo size, and complete in itself.*

Epochs of Ancient History.

A series of Books narrating the HISTORY OF GREECE AND ROME, and of their relations to other Countries at Successive Epochs. Edited by the Rev. G. W. COX, M. A., Author of the "Aryan Mythology," "A History of Greece," etc., and jointly by CHARLES SANKEY, M. A., late Scholar of Queen's College, Oxford.

Volumes already issued in the "Epochs of Ancient History." Each one volume 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

The GREEKS and the PERSIANS. By the Rev. G. W. Cox, M. A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford: Joint Editor of the Series. With four colored Maps.

The EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE. From the Assassination of Julius Cæsar to the Assassination of Domitian. By the Rev. W. WOLFE CAPES, M. A., Reader of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. With two colored maps.

The ATHENIAN EMPIRE from the FLIGHT of XERXES to the FALL of ATHENS. By the Rev. G. W. Cox, M. A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford: Joint Editor of the Series. With five Maps.

The ROMAN TRIUMVIRATES. By the Very Rev. CHARLES MERIVALE, D. D., Dean of Ely.

EARLY ROME, to its Capture by the Gauls. By WILHELM IHNE, Author of "History of Rome." With Map.

THE AGE OF THE ANTONINES. By the Rev. W. WOLFE CAPES, M. A., Reader of Ancient History in the University at Oxford.

The GRACCHI, MARIUS, and SULLA. By A. H. BEESLY. With Maps.

THE RISE OF THE MACEDONIAN EMPIRE. By A. M. CURTEIS, M. A. 1 vol., 16mo, with maps and plans.

TROY — Its Legend, History, and Literature, with a sketch of the Topography of the Troad in the light of recent investigation. By S. G. W. BENJAMIN. 1 vol. 16mo. With a map.

*** *The above books for sale by all booksellers, or will be sent, post or express charges paid, upon receipt of the price by the Publishers,*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

D65 .R26
The origin of nations, in two parts, On
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00051 7401